DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 500 TE 001 500

By-Pearson, Justus R., Jr.; Reese, James Robert
Project Grammar: The Linguistic and Language Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English. Interim Report.
Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date Mar 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-72p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.70
Descriptors-Applied Linguistics, *Curriculum Evaluation, Education Majors, *English Education, *English Instruction, Grammar, Language Instruction, *Linguistics, Preservice Education, Secondary Education, *Teacher Education, Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Educators, Teacher Improvement, Teaching Skills
Identifiers-Project English

A 2-year national study of the preparation of prospective English and linguistics secondary school teachers was conducted to determine current opinions on the present preparation of English teachers, ways of improving this preparation, and methods to pedagogically order and present linguistic material. Data were gathered and tabulated from (1) a questionnaire survey sent to professors and department heads in existing English education programs in colleges and universities whose student enrollment exceeded 300, and (2) personal interviews with linguists and directors of English curriculum study centers. Results revealed that (1) existing programs in teacher education are considered to be inadequate for classroom practice, (2) department chairmen, professors, and linguists disagree as to the number and content of required courses but agree that students interested in teaching English should take at least one three-semester sequential language course specifically designed for prospective English teachers, and (3) educators feel that college courses should make students aware of methods of linguistic analyis and offer practical application of linguistics principles to emphasize the breadth of language study. (Author/MP)

ED031500

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-8-25-67

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Project Grammar:
The Linguistic and Language Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English

Justus R. Pearson, Jr.
Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois

James Robert Reese
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

March, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 001 500

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois, non-voting member
William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, past member
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 2

METHOD 4

RESULTS

  Questionnaire One 6

    Departmental Responsibility--English or Education . 8

    Linguistic and English Language Courses Required or Recommended 9

    Linguistic and English Language Courses Available as Electives 10

    Current Changes in Present Linguistic and English Language Programs 11

    Opinions and Attitudes of Department Chairmen . . . 12

  Questionnaire Two 19

DISCUSSION

  Five Linguistic Interviews 27

  The Experimental Classes 38

    Recommended Sequence of Courses 49

    Course I: General Language and Linguistics . . . 50

    Course II: The English Language 54

    Course III: Applied Linguistics 57

    A Preliminary Experimental Course: English 101 . . 58

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 65

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The directors of ISCPET and the authors wish to express their gratitude to Miss Helen Bohlen for her dedicated and expert assistance in the preparation of the final copy for this publication.

SUMMARY

"Project Grammar," one of the thirty-two Special Research Studies of the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, was a two-year investigation into the needed linguistic and English language preparation of prospective secondary school teachers of English. Its principal objective was to investigate the national status of the linguistic and English language preparation of the future English teacher and to make recommendations concerning the changes needed in the preparatory curriculums of the prospective secondary school teacher of English.

The purpose of the study was not to justify the inclusion of linguistics in the secondary school English curriculum nor to establish that the linguistically trained English teacher is more effective than his non-linguistically trained counterpart; rather, it was to gather current thoughts and opinions on present preparation and on the desirable preparation of the English teacher, and to establish a possible pedagogical ordering of linguistic material. The results of the study are not directed to the professional linguist, who has already reached personal conclusions concerning what linguistic knowledge the English teacher needs or does not need, but to English and education department chairmen and professors who are not trained primarily in linguistics. It is hoped that the report will aid in removing certain common misconceptions current in English departments--e.g., those resulting from a lack of distinction between the study of the discipline itself and the study of various systems of grammatical analysis, the non-distinguishing between the learning of a system of grammatical analysis and the learning of English grammar, the over-emphasis on the disagreements among linguists, the lack of distinction between pedagogical and analytic grammars--and that it will reveal basic inadequacies in present preparatory programs as well as indicate ways in which they might be improved.

The project consisted of four investigatory steps: 1) the sending of questionnaires to English and education department chairmen across the country and the tabulation of the responses; 2) the sending of questionnaires to professors teaching courses in language and linguistic study and the tabulation of the responses; 3) the interviewing of various eminent linguists and directors of English curriculum study centers, and 4) the designing and teaching of experimental classes in English language and linguistic study.

The first stages of Project Grammar's investigation gathered detailed information concerning the attitudes of department chairmen toward the needed linguistic and English language preparation of the prospective secondary English teacher as well as information on the actual content of the required or recommended courses in these areas. Later, the interviews with linguists and the directors of various English curriculum study centers suggested recommendations for minimal courses for both the present and the future needs of secondary school English teachers. The experimental classes taught at Illinois Wesleyan University were a means of ordering and testing the recommendations of courses. The courses specifically recommended as minimal are these: General Language and Linguistics, The English Language, and Applied Linguistics.

INTRODUCTION

The investigation which has gone forward under the title "Project Grammar" did not start at A and proceed to Z in a straight line, nor did it get to any other letter of the alphabet by a direct course. The project grew out of an idea, was shaped by both the possible and the impossible discovered along the way, and was terminated by time rather than by the completion of a cycle of discoveries. The name Project Grammar itself was a catchphrase which wilfully echoed the big surge of interest in the discipline of English in the Sixties, first publicized as "Project English" and later converted into a number of other less memorable titles. Part way through the project being summarized here, it became evident that the title's focus on grammar was too narrow. But because the name was familiar to the many persons who labored to fill out elaborate questionnaires, it seemed preferable to use the title Project Grammar for this report and to underscore the subtitle which was used on the questionnaires: "The Linguistic and Language Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English." The subtitle comes very close to the heart of what the project attempted to focus upon, both at the beginning and at the end; but it is of course too long and unwieldy for a working title.

The project has as its parent a larger study, with an even more unwieldy title: the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET). We have lived with the name ISCPET for five years, and it is easier to manage and to remember than the full name for which it stands. ISCPET, with headquarters at the University of Illinois in Urbana and under the general direction of Professor J. N. Hook, was awarded a grant by the U. S. Office of Education to inquire into better ways and means of preparing high school teachers of English. Twenty Illinois colleges and universities joined their forces in English and education to investigate the courses and other modes of education which are employed to prepare teachers of English. Representatives of these institutions met and worked out in concert a manifesto, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," which was printed in the November 1965 issue of College English.

It was the purpose of the Qualifications Statement to set forth what the forty institutional representatives and their advisors thought were desirable and necessary components of the education of a student preparing to teach English in the secondary schools. The five major subdivisions of the statement treated Knowledge of Language, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, Knowledge and Skill in Literature, Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, and Knowledge and Skill in the Teaching of English. Each of the five areas listed the qualifications in three degrees of attainment, minimal, good, and superior, with only the good and superior ratings held to be satisfactory. The minimal qualifications were given only to show what was basic to attaining the "good" qualifications.

Because the thrust for Project Grammar grew directly out of the qualifications sought in the area of language, it will be useful to see that portion of the Preliminary Qualifications Statement:

KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGE

Minimal	Good	Superior
An understanding of how language functions	A detailed understanding of how language functions, including knowledge of the principles of semantics	Sufficient knowledge to illustrate richly and specifically the areas listed under "Good"
A reasonably detailed knowledge of one system of English grammar and a working familiarity with another system	A detailed knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar	
A knowledge of the present standards of educated usage: knowledge of the various levels of usage and how those levels are determined	A thorough knowledge of levels of usage; some knowledge of dialectology, a realization of the cultural implications of both	
	A knowledge of the history of the English language, with appropriate awareness of its phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes	

In the groping to draw some kind of reasonable boundaries to our search for a "better way of doing things" in the preparation of English teachers, and particularly in those discussions which focused on language, four current grammars were acknowledged. First among these was the conventional, traditional-functional grammar, and then the more recondite grammars which we labeled as structural, taxonomic, and transformational. This was in 1965. The problem seemed relatively simple: to determine which two of the grammars could best serve the desired end, by which a prospective teacher of secondary school English would be assured of "a detailed knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar." Once it was known which two systems to recommend, or at least understood what might be the advantages and disadvantages of the various combinations of two grammars from among the four, a major portion of our Qualifications Statement could be shifted from the 'preliminary' state to the 'conclusive' state. Thus was Project Grammar brought into being, to investigate the "best" grammars for preparing young teachers.

There were wiser moments, too. We felt, collectively, the need to understand the relationships among the four grammars which were then competing for attention in the academic marketplace, and we also felt that the teachers should be aware of those relationships. The general attitude was pluralistic rather than partisan, in respect to the grammars. We felt it was desirable to open up to the student a sense of the wide range of choices available to him; but we recognized that a person might well get lost in the rapidly expanding world of grammars. If ever an area of study needed canvassing and reporting, it was the area to be questioned by Project Grammar.

Since ISCPET was a cooperative, decentralized curriculum study "center," it was incumbent upon each participating institution to undertake one or more special research studies in the preparation of secondary school English teachers. Project Grammar was undertaken, institutionally, by Illinois Wesleyan University, a liberal arts undergraduate college in central Illinois. The investigation would be largely a matter of paperwork, with the usual questionnaire and probably some consultation with the most articulate scholars in the area of language and linguistics. The limitations of the study were not apparent in the beginning, of course, nor did two years seem too short a span to complete the objectives.

In summary, the purpose was to help guide the prospective English teacher in his education in grammar; our assumption was that two systems of grammar would give the teacher a good perspective on the problems of teaching a grammar to contemporary students; and our objective was to learn which two grammars, among those presently recognized as being meaningful, would most likely produce the desired results. Our study was without a model. We anticipated that we would be cutting new ground.

METHOD

The proposal for conducting the work of Project Grammar, as submitted to the Executive Committee of the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, appears in retrospect to have established a base midway between the Introduction (i.e., problem and objectives) and the Method of this report's structure. It is useful to quote the two paragraphs of the proposal in this place, for they establish accurately our point of departure:

> There is proposed herein a study to determine what grammars are being taught in colleges and universities in the mid-1960's, especially in courses which are offered for prospective high school teachers. The study aims to learn, if possible, the following things: what the makers of various English curricula had in mind; what the catalog descriptions of courses contained; what the individual teachers believed the course descriptions to entail; and what the actual classroom practice revealed to be both desirable and possible.

> An adjunct to the project, of marked importance, is to devise a course in grammar(s) for use in colleges and universities where high school teachers of English are educated, hopefully a course that would succeed in giving students 'a detailed knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar'--the desideratum of ISCPET's Preliminary Statement of Qualifications--or its equivalent. The delineation of such a course in grammar would then entitle ISCPET to retain, in its final statement, a qualification about grammar(s) as part of a prospective teacher's knowledge of language.

The project did maintain both the study of what grammars were being taught and the construction of a course in grammar(s) for use in colleges and universities. In the process of establishing and conducting these investigations, new avenues and means of exploration were devised.

Originally, the project was to be carried on over a two-year period, terminating in June, 1968. A research associate was appointed, whose role was to devise questionnaires and assemble the information elicited by them, to visit selected campuses in Illinois and across the country for the purpose of gathering information about courses in grammar(s) planned or taught, to construct and conduct a course at Illinois Wesleyan University for experimental work in the training of English majors, both teaching candidates and others, to summarize the results of the research, and to prepare, with the aid of the director, the final report on the project.

The initial plan called for the preparation and circulation of a questionnaire, which would be sent to selected colleges and universities across the country, to learn what courses in grammar(s) were taught. The research associate was to visit selected institutions, examining programs in detail and interviewing teachers, students, and curriculum-makers. Furthermore, he was to prepare a course in linguistics (including grammars) for a second-semester offering (Spring, 1967) at Illinois Wesleyan--a pilot course. We also planned to arrange a conference of five or six nationally known specialists in language (especially grammar), with the purpose of assessing the validity of the project's discoveries and of seeking guidelines for further research and experimentation. This conference was planned to coincide with one of the national language meetings, e.g., NCTE or MLA, in order to minimize expenses and maximize the stature of the participants. No such conference was actually convened; the project went out to the individual specialists for consultation, and their comments helped to give shape to the project as it progressed rather than to fix a stamp of approval or disapproval on its completion. Finally, according to the original plan, the research associate was to teach a revised course in linguistics (including grammars) in the second semester of the second year, incorporating such new insights as had been gathered from the questionnaire and interviews with specialists. A tidy final report would polish off the two years of research. As a final gesture of good will, and if time should permit, there were plans for a follow-up study among the student teachers who had taken the pilot course in linguistics in the second semester of the project's first year. Needless to say, the clock ran out.

Against the structure described above, which was the project's original plan, it is fairly easy to note the changes which were instituted. For example, there were two questionnaires instead of one, both with rather large mailings. And there were three experimental courses conducted instead of a single course which was to be run twice, and one of the three was given a second time, enough changed to entitle it to be called a fourth course. This unexpected increase in the pedagogical aspects of the project changed quite radically the total character of the whole study, moving it out of the class of a static report on current practices and into the range of what might be done in new teaching techniques. This shift from statics to dynamics was the most important change made in Project Grammar during its existence.

It has already been mentioned above that the project went to the specialists, in a reversal of the original plan to call a conference. Also, the research associate visited several of the English curriculum study centers to assess the materials which were being created in those places, materials which would very probably influence upcoming classes of students preparing to teach English in the secondary schools. Visits to institutions on both coasts of the United States as well as to points in between, and active roles in many of the professional meetings held during the two years of the project's duration, helped to keep Project Grammar's personnel in touch with the times. If specific information was gathered from the two widely circulated questionnaires, the important temper of the era in linguistics and the teaching of language was sampled by personal inquiry and, occasionally, was given out in a position paper or progress report. The intention was to find out what was going on across the country, to sample opinions on as many levels as possible, both theoretical and pedagogical, and to set forth some of the incoming data so that there could be a chance for both lay and professional reaction. No worlds were torn loose and no reputations damaged.

RESULTS

Questionnaire One

Project Grammar's first questionnaire was not designed solely to gather statistical data on the present state of the linguistic and English language preparation of the prospective secondary school teachers of English. It sought to find the reasons and rationales which lay behind existing programs in the nation's colleges and universities. The complexity of the questionnaire permitted a wide variety of responses, and invited both positive and negative data so that insights into the problem could be had from what was not said as well as from what was said. There were basically ten points on which information was sought, all pertaining to the preparation of secondary school teachers of English:

(1) What departments in the college or university are responsible for their education?

(2) What linguistic or English language courses are recommended or required?

(3) In addition to those recommended or required, what linguistic or English language courses are also available?

(4) What is the nature of the present programs in linguistics and English language study?

(5) Are present programs undergoing significant change?

(6) What are the opinions and attitudes of department chairmen on (a) the adequacy of current programs for educating students; (b) the minimal and maximal semester hours which should be required; (c) the necessity of various grammatical systems of analysis (e.g., transformational-generative, structural, traditional-functional, traditional-scholarly, tagmemics, stratificational, and others); (d) the desirability of various courses (as listed in Section IV of the questionnaire); (e) the desirability of teaching such additional fields as modern dialectology (including various modern American dialects), the history of the English language, psycholinguistics, phonology, morphology, philology, lexicography, and English language for the disadvantaged; (f) the language or linguistic knowledge considered essential for the student; and (g) the ideal and minimal preparation for students in the above areas?

(7) Are English department chairmen thinking, in general, in terms of broad language and linguistic education, or in terms of the so-called problem areas of functional grammar?

(8) If department heads (English or education) believe that linguistics is valuable, is this belief reflected in the number and types of courses offered or required?

(9) If current programs do not meet minimal standards, what are the possible explanations for the deficiencies?

(10) What is the level of acuteness and sophistication of chairmen of departments of English and education in respect to the areas covered by the foregoing questions?

The questionnaire was designed, it is apparent, to gather maximum information as to what subject matter was being taught, why such subject matter was being taught, and what the opinions and experiences of department chairmen were in regard to linguistics and English language study. As a means of elaborating the latter area, the chairmen were asked to state, in addition to their answers to specific questions, what they considered to be both the ideal and the minimal programs in linguistics and English language studies for prospective teachers of secondary school English. It was believed that those department chairmen who knew little or nothing about linguistics might reveal directly or indirectly the points at which they accepted or resisted the discipline. Such information could then later be used to explain aspects of the present state of English teacher education. Some chairmen could thus supply information that might be valuable in planning courses and shaping ideas for the future. Project Grammar was not the testing of an assumption but was the gathering of thoughts, opinions, and statistical data on which to base recommendations to those institutions which may believe that their current programs are inadequate.

Questionnaire One was sent to 1,245 chairmen across the country, 1,020 of them chairmen of English departments and 225 of them chairmen of education departments. A questionnaire was sent to the English department chairman of every four-year college and university in the United States where the total college enrollment was at least 300 students. In a period when the institutions are growing as rapidly as they have done in the Sixties, a few of the smaller colleges may have been slighted if their size was not adequately recorded in the standard lists used; but the investigators made every effort to give the survey a sense of completeness and broad representation.

Of the total of 1,245 questionnaires sent out, 601 (48.2%) were completed and returned. Sixty-two departmental chairmen who did not return the questionnaire did, however, send information concerning the program at their institutions, and these additions increased the total of replies to 663 (53.2%) individuals responding. Since questionnaires were addressed to both English and education department chairmen, the latter on a selected basis, the total number of institutions canvassed was 1,040. Responses came from 560 (53.8%) of these institutions, with an additional 52 institutions replying by means other than completing the questionnaire. Thus, information came from a total of 612 (58.5%) of the colleges and universities on the mailing list of 1,040. In summary, the determinations of Project Grammar were based, in respect to Questionnaire One, on information received from 58.8% of the four-year colleges and universities in the United States where the enrollment was more than 300 and where courses in English at the junior and senior level were taught. It may be added that Questionnaire Two, sent to faculty members teaching linguistics and/or English language courses, was sent to 789 individuals in 406 institutions. A total of 333 (42.2%) persons, representing 308 (75.6%) institutions, responded to Questionnaire Two. When the responses of both questionnaires are combined, information was received from colleges and universities in every state of the Union, representing every size and type of institution. The data received may accurately reflect not only the present state of linguistic and English language study across the nation, but also the opinions and attitudes of both English department chairmen and the professors of such courses.

Departmental Responsibility--English or Education

In 75% of the institutions surveyed, the preparation of prospective secondary school teachers of English was the joint responsibility of the English and education departments. In the majority of these institutions, the English department was responsible for the student's major area or discipline, and the education department for the professional courses required for certification. Several areas or classes were taught jointly by the two departments. In only 2% of the institutions was the preparation solely the responsibility of the English department, and in only 6% was it the responsibility of the education department. In 11%, the English and education departments had separate programs, that is, both had programs, one presumably leading to the B.A. degree and the other leading to the B.S. degree. In 6% of the institutions the response was "other," meaning that their preparatory programs were not like any of those mentioned just above. They had not been asked, however, to give further details.

Where the responsibility for the program lay with the two departments jointly (75%) or with the English department alone (2%), it is interesting to note that the English department had the responsibility for the student's major area or discipline. The total figure of 77% could actually be raised by adding a portion of the figure (11%) from those institutions with two separate programs, on the assumption that the English department would have control of the preparatory work in both programs. Thus, in something over four out of five institutions surveyed the goals and standards for the students' major area (including work in linguistics) were determined by the English department. And although a few states now require, for state certification, a specific course in linguistics or English language study, none of them require a standardized sequence of courses. It seems fair to say that it is the English departments that determine the number, kind, and quality of linguistic and English language courses given.

Linguistic and English Language Courses Required or Recommended

The course most frequently required of prospective teachers of secondary school English is one in the history of the English language. Two hundred and twenty-eight (48%) of the institutions surveyed required the prospective secondary school teacher of English to complete such a course. Although this course varies in content, it may be described in general as being the traditional course in the history of the language, the content of which has altered little in the last fifty years. As reported by English department chairmen, this traditional course is to emphasize the general phonological, morphological, and syntactic development of the English language from Anglo-Saxon times to the present. The student's attention is focused on Grimm's law, the great vowel shift, back formations, folk etymology, illustrative paradigms of Old English and Middle English, isoglosses of linguistic features, and generalized statements about Old and Middle English inflections and dialects. The texts most frequently indicated were A. C. Baugh's _A History of the English Language_, Robertson and Cassidy's _The Development of Modern English_, Thomas Pyles' _Origins and Developments of Modern English_, and Otto Jespersen's _Growth and Structure of the English Language_. Lest it should be assumed, however, that all teaching of the subject is to be characterized in such a fashion, 15% of the institutions responding noted that they offer a course in the history of the English language which does stress a modern approach, namely, an inductive experience in language analysis which examines selected passages ranging from Old English to Early Modern English.

The second most frequently required course is one in advanced English grammar required by 197 (42%) institutions. Although the content of this course is more varied than that of the conventional course in the history of the language, it is for the most part a normative course in advanced English grammar or syntax. It treats the sentence and its parts, attempting to give the student a base for teaching accepted usage, punctuation practices, and frequently used grammatical structures. The basic analytic tool employed in this course is traditional-functional grammar, with frequently a smattering of immediate constituent analysis and form and function word study included. The course is thus a class in traditional-functional grammar, modified a little by immediate constituent analysis.

The third-ranked course among requirements may be described as a modified introductory course in linguistics. Such a course is required by 71 (15%) institutions, and it ostensibly introduces the student to various approaches to language study (structural, transformational-generative, or others). In reality, the course would appear to be not so much an introduction to modern linguistics as a miscellany of language information drawn predominantly from the tenets of early structural linguistics and traditional-scholarly grammar, with a little semantics blended in. Emphasis is placed on obtaining familiarity with schools of linguistic thought such as those mentioned just above, together with a little very specific information about certain aspects of English. The basic texts used for such a course, listed in order of greatest frequency, are Fries' American English Grammar, Hayakawa's Language in Thought and Action, Allen's Readings in Applied English Linguistics, Francis' The Structure of American English, Bloomfield's Language, Jespersen's A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Gleason's An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, Sledd's A Short Introduction to English Grammar, and Chomsky's Syntactic Structures. It was not possible to ascertain from the responses the precise nature of such a course. Although some idea of a given course could be gathered from a familiarity with the text required, supplementary reading material was not called for by the questionnaire, and even where a single text was required, a mastery of its contents was not obligatory. The general indication was that a survey of modern linguistics was the goal, rather than the intensive study of a system of analysis.

There were other courses which were required, focusing either wholly or partially on linguistics or English language study. Included were a course in oral reading (3), a course in the teaching of English (7), a course in the structure and sounds of modern English (16), and a course in English grammar and composition (25). The courses in the structure and sounds of modern English used either Fries' The Structure of English or Francis' The Structure of American English as their basic texts, while the courses in grammar and composition were generally considered by the department chairmen to be devoted chiefly to advanced composition, with traditional-functional grammar studied as a supplement to the writing of compositions. Several courses required the students to read Hayakawa's Language in Thought and Action and selections from Mencken's The American Language.

The courses recommended for an English teacher's preparation were closely parallel to those required, though in smaller percentages. A course in the history of the English language was recommended in 129 (28%) institutions, a course in advanced or modern grammar in 77 (17%) institutions, and a course in introductory linguistics in 76 (16%) institutions. Other courses recommended, listed in order of greatest frequency, were in semantics (7), advanced composition and grammar (4), stylistics (2), modern American dialects (2), etymology (2), and advanced rhetoric (2).

Linguistic and English Language Courses Available as Electives

Questionnaire One sought to establish what linguistic and English language courses are currently being offered to undergraduates. It gave descriptions of sixteen possible courses and asked the respondent to indicate if any of the courses were offered at his institution, regardless of the department that might be responsible for it. Space was provided for the listing of any course not described in the list but offered at that institution. The following responses are given in the order of greatest frequency and the course descriptions echo the wording used in Questionnaire One.

Sixty-nine percent of the institutions offer "a course in rhetoric or advanced composition which gives further training beyond the traditional freshman year." Though not actually a course in linguistics or English language study, this one was included because it might be considered so by a number of department chairmen. Sixty-seven percent offer "a course in the history of the English language which emphasizes the phonological, morphological, and syntactic development of the language," 15% of the institutions adding that they address this course specifically to the secondary school teacher of English and place stress on those aspects which are presumably most useful to him in his teaching. Sixty-one percent offer "an introductory course in modern English grammar or linguistics which introduces the student to various approaches to language study (e.g., structural, transformational-generative)." Of the 61%, 21% are pedagogically based, and 40% are not so based.

Forty-nine percent offer "a normative course in advanced English grammar or syntax treating the sentence and its parts, designed either to give the student a basis in accepted usage, punctuation, and essential grammatical constructions," or directed towards supplying him with a basis for teaching these areas. Twenty-four percent offer "a course in Old English which emphasizes the reading of pre-Norman literature as well as the study of Old English." Twenty percent offer "a course in phonetics which focuses on general phonology as well as on those phonetic and phonemic aspects peculiar to English," the course almost always being offered by the speech department. Eighteen percent offer "a course in English language study, either structural or transformational-generative linguistics." Eleven percent offer "a course in the philosophy of language which gives the student a broad understanding of language and its relation to man's cultural, social, and intellectual growth."

Eleven percent offer "a course in comparative linguistics emphasizing those aspects of English which are common to other Indo-European languages." Ten percent offer "a course in English vocabulary or lexicology focusing on the major sources and structure of modern English words." Eight percent offer "a course in English language study which attempts to increase the student's awareness of common errors in usage, spelling, and punctuation made by secondary school students." Lastly, three percent offer "a course in language study for the disadvantaged emphasizing those aspects of language, language study, and methods of instruction which are peculiar to or helpful to the teaching of English to disadvantaged students."

Several of the respondents chose to consider the descriptions listed in the questionnaire as areas of study rather than as individual courses; and if several areas happened to be included in one course, several descriptions were checked. For this reason, the percentages given above should probably be lowered if a count of actual courses is desired. But even if one does not make this adjustment, it is clear that, with the exception of a course in the history of the English language and a normative course in advanced grammar, it is not common for institutions to have significant offerings in linguistics or in English language studies.

Current Changes in Present Linguistic and English Language Programs

English department chairmen were asked to describe such changes as they might be making in their program by adding or revising courses. Of those who responded, 36% indicated that they were in the process of adding a course in linguistics or English language study, but 64%, a strong majority, indicated that they have no plans for doing so. Again, 26% of the department chairmen indicated that they were revising a present offering but, in general, the revisions were minor. No institutions were discontinuing a course without replacing it. In respect to the size of an institution, there appeared to be no correlation between size (and therefore, perhaps, resources) and either the amount of revision taking place or the variety of an English department's offerings.

Opinions and Attitudes of Department Chairmen

Ten of the twenty-two questions which comprised Questionnaire One were designed to elicit the opinions and attitudes of the department chairmen who answered them. Question IV provided a list of sixteen possible linguistic and English language courses, requesting the respondent to indicate which ones should be required/recommended or offered in the preparation of the secondary school teacher of English. A numerical tabulation of the responses can be seen in the Appendix, but the number of responses to any given course was uneven. This unevenness was caused by some chairmen marking only those courses which were being taught currently in their institutions while others indicated their opinions on all courses whether they were being taught or not. It is therefore difficult to give accurate percentages concerning the opinions of the respondents towards any individual course. It is possible, however, to discern general preferences.

A majority of respondents believe that "a course in the history of the English language, emphasizing the phonological, morphological, and syntactic development of the English language" should be required or recommended. They were almost equally divided as to whether or not such a course should be addressed specifically to the secondary school teacher of English. Further, a large majority of English department chairmen believe that the second most important course is "a normative course in advanced English grammar or syntax, treating the sentence and its parts, aimed at giving the student a basis for teaching accepted usage in language, punctuation, and essential grammatical constructions." Almost all chairmen believe it is essential to require such a course.

Department chairmen believe that two other courses are of significant value to be required or recommended: "an introductory course in modern English grammar or linguistics which is not basically pedagogical or prescriptive in tone, but which introduces the student to various approaches to language study (structural, descriptive, transformational-generative, or others)," and "a course in rhetoric or advanced composition giving further training beyond the traditional freshman year."

Question VII was very much like Question IV in that it asked the respondent to give a brief description of any linguistic or English language course which he thought would be valuable in the student's preparation. A total of 187 courses were suggested, and although there was repetition in the listing, the range of suggestions was surprising. Some courses had restricted aims, such as an investigation of the relationship between sounds and spellings in English. Others had aims that were anything but restricted, such as a course which would teach "the content and structure and techniques of language and literature in order to give teachers breadth of vision and personal convictions, a knowledge of human nature and an immense capacity for awe and wonder." The two most frequently suggested courses, however, were in the fields of dialectology and semantics. A few respondents specified that the latter was to be a course in general semantics; department chairmen consistently recommended the study of modern American dialects.

Over two-thirds of the courses suggested belong to two broad areas of study, applied linguistics and socio-cultural linguistics. There was a general concern that the student should be prepared so that he could relate his knowledge to teaching situations, especially to the teaching of culturally deprived students and to the speakers of nonstandard dialects. Department chairmen were also concerned with the fact that the prospective teacher might not be taught the possible relationship between linguistics and other areas such as composition, literary analysis, bilingualism, and reading. Many indicated that they thought some attention should be given to placing modern linguistic schools within a historical perspective.

Question X bore what was originally the main focus of Project Grammar, namely, "Do you believe that a secondary school teacher of English should have a basic knowledge of two or more systems of English grammar (such as traditional, descriptive, transformational-generative, and the like)?" If the answer was yes, the respondent was asked to name the systems. Ninety-five percent did answer yes; 73% named traditional grammar (scholarly and functional), 71% named transformational-generative grammar, and 68% named descriptive grammar (structural, immediate constituent). Regrettably, except in those instances where a distinction was made by the respondent, there was no way to establish whether the respondents were thinking in terms of traditional-school or traditional-scholarly grammars. Approximately 25% of the chairmen said that the student should also receive instruction in some type of tagmemic grammar.

Question XI asked: "Do you think that a course in the history of the English language should be required of prospective secondary school English teachers? Please explain why it should or should not be required." When we consider the general desire on the part of English department chairmen for both breadth and depth in the students' linguistic preparation and their acute awareness of curriculum restrictions, it is perhaps surprising at first to learn that 81% of them believe a course in the history of the English language should be required, since it would be at the expense of other linguistic learning. Unless there were twelve semester hours available--the ideal amount of time as conceived by department chairmen--it would be impossible to devote a semester's course to the study of the history of the English language and have adequate time left for other linguistic study. Such a suggestion is, however, characteristic of the general pattern of departmental thinking, which often strives to retain the old no matter what and add the new if there is time.

The question invited the chairmen to state why they thought such a course should be required. The course is, in fact, generally thought of as being capable of accomplishing almost anything, and is looked upon as a miraculous moment in the linguistic education of a student. A few justifications given for requiring the course follow:

> It is needed as background for intelligently teaching grammar and composition.
>
> For obvious reasons too numerous to mention.
>
> Helps them to understand that language changes.
>
> Prevents students from being provincial about their language.
>
> Teachers need to know the best of English in order to teach modern corruptions.
>
> Enhances understanding of the English language.
>
> It should help him.

Enables the teacher to explain many structures and concepts not readily available to the high school students.

Gives a basis for functional grammar.

To enable teachers to answer student questions.

A teacher should understand that language changes and changes according to basic principles.

Enables an instructor to teach older literature more intelligently.

Decisions about usage problems should be made in a historical perspective.

Because of its intrinsic cultural value.

It gives perspective and depth to his understanding of the English language.

It should be required in order to give some basis for a young person's evolving philosophy of language, his understanding of the role of language in the process of civilizing man, and in order to understand language as a tool for personal and social growth.

To block the generation of folk etymologies by secondary teachers.

It organizes all previous courses in word study or word development treating the subject historically.

Their knowledge of the backgrounds of accepted usage will make them once more aware of present usage and less authoritarian and prescriptive.

Necessary for understanding the approach of modern grammars.

It will make Americans understand their debt to the French language and bring us closer together.

Many errors are made in statements about Modern English through ignorance of the past. I have noted these from the so-called 'New Linguists,' say that language is oral. [sic]

Language reflects the history and culture of its speakers.

It is basic to an understanding of language, composition, and literature.

No other course offers the student the perspective necessary to view his own language.

The complete listing would be quite extensive. If one were to discount certain of the most dubious justifications for requiring a course in the history of the English language, such as the belief that an understanding of it will improve our political relations with France, there are eight basic reasons why department chairmen think the course valuable:

(1) It enables one to better understand certain syntactic and morphemic structures of modern English.

(2) It is necessary for the understanding of modern systems of analysis.

(3) It enables one to understand the process of language change.

(4) It prevents prescriptive attitudes towards language.

(5) It is needed in order to teach older English literary selections.

(6) It has an intrinsic cultural value.

(7) It increases one's ability to deal with problems of usage.

(8) It helps one understand the nature and history of modern linguistics.

Two questions ought to be answered before one accepts such justifications for requiring a course in the history of the English language. The first is whether or not such a course is capable of accomplishing the goals that English department chairmen set for it, and the second is whether or not these goals might not be accomplished more effectively through other means. When we come to assess the course's utility, we should keep in view the strong probability that, in the past, and for the reason that the course in the history of the language was the only introduction to language that a student received, material extraneous to its nature was tacked onto it until it was not really a course in the history of the language but a miscellany of linguistic facts and historical data touching the English language.

Question XIII of Questionnaire One asked department chairmen whether they believed the present preparation of secondary school English teachers in linguistics and English language study to be adequate. Eighty-two percent said no. The question also asked what was most lacking in the preparation. As in all the free response questions, the range of answers was overwhelming, but the general consensus was that the ingredient most lacking was time. There is thus the sharp realization that in a course of one quarter's or one semester's duration only an introduction to an introduction to language study can be given; and, contrary to what might be concluded when one examines the stated goals of current programs, department chairmen are aware of the fact that students do not receive adequate instruction in either current systems of grammatical analysis or in general linguistics. In fact, one notices a sense of frustration in many of the short answers about what is lacking: "Everything," "Up-to-date knowledge of development and structure of the language," "Variety of courses, depth of study," "Applications of systems of new grammar," "Basic concepts of the nature of language," "Adequate knowledge of grammar, grammaticality, and contemporary theories of syntax," "More understanding of the social and cultural features of language," "More time is needed for practical application," "Labs are needed," and "Time to cover the various approaches to linguistics adequately."

Conceivably, such answers to a question about what is lacking in the preparation of a student teacher also told what is lacking in the preparation of college and university teachers, the students' mentors. It was often noted that there were not enough professors of suitable education and experience to staff the needed courses. An additional point of interest was that, although the respondents felt in general that current post-Jespersen knowledge was lacking, many did not want to do away with present instruction in traditional-functional grammar. Some did, of course. But often, as in other responses, department chairmen were thinking in terms of adding new information, not necessarily in terms of replacing the old. Two areas of understanding frequently mentioned as lacking were a general knowledge of the linguistic discipline, such as would be provided by a course in general language and linguistics, and a knowledge of how to apply systems of grammatical analysis, as well as general linguistic knowledge, to practical situations. English department chairmen believe that, to be adequately prepared, the English teacher must not only be aware of the complete discipline but must be able to utilize his knowledge.

Question XIV provided the first of two opportunities for department chairmen to address themselves to the problem of the hours which would constitute a suitable program (Questions XXI and XXII, below, treated ideal and minimum programs): "In a four-year preparatory period for secondary school teachers of English, what is (approximately) the maximum and the minimum number of semester hours (exclusive of rhetoric courses) which should be allotted to linguistics and English language study?" When one considers the present average course requirement--four semester hours--the recommended minimum and maximum semester hours are revealing. English department chairmen believe that the minimum acceptable instruction period in linguistics and English language study is 5.76 semester hours, with the given hours ranging from 2 to 32 and the mean being 6. The average suggested maximum requirement is 11.7 hours, with the range being from 2 to 45 and the mean being 12. Thus, two or more semester courses in linguistics or English language study is considered by at least 50% of the department chairmen responding to be the absolute minimum requirement necessary for the adequate preparation of a secondary school teacher of English. Fifty percent or more of the chairmen believe that a requirement of four semester courses in these areas would be ideal. Only 36% think that one course is adequate preparation, and only 1% believes that the student should have no instruction in these areas. Thus it would seem indisputable that department chairmen are in favor of educating prospective teachers in linguistics and English language study, whether or not such instruction is being given at present.

Question XVIII listed twenty-one areas of study (as given immediately below) and asked which of them "you think the secondary school teacher of English should be familiar with." Respondents were invited to check all areas they felt to be appropriate. The areas are listed here in the order of their importance to the chairmen:

Traditional grammar	90%
History of the English language	90%
Descriptive linguistics	86%
Transformational-generative grammar	78%
Semantics	71%

Various modern American dialects	56%
The phonology of modern English	54%
The morphology of modern English	53%
The physical apparatus of speech (organs)	46%
General morphology	43%
General phonology	42%
Dialectology	40%
Socio-cultural linguistics	38%
English language for the disadvantaged	38%
Lexicology	37%
Geographical linguistics	35%
Philology	22%
Psycholinguistics	18%
Tagmemic analysis	17%
Comparative linguistics (Indo-European)	16%
European structuralism	4%

Question XIX sought to go "inside" the areas of study given in Question XVIII and presented a list of thirty-two terms and concepts (not intended to be exhaustive) having to do with linguistics and English language study. Department chairmen were asked to indicate whether they thought each term or concept was essential, desirable, or unnecessary to the education of a preparatory teacher. This second list was not answered as consistently or as often as Question XVIII; it is, therefore, not as adequate an indicator as the earlier question in eliciting what department chairmen actually thought to be of value in a teacher's preparation. Although 87% of those returning Questionnaire One responded to this question, it was obvious that some writers checked every term and concept as essential, regardless of whether they might be familiar with it or not. But despite all the difficulties of assessing Question XIX, it is apparent that, while chairmen are not in agreement as to what linguistic or English language terms and concepts are essential in the preparation of a teacher, there is nevertheless a tendency for them to think in broad, inclusive categories and not have their students work in limited areas such as usage and normative grammar.

Question XXI and XXII allowed respondents to amplify and clarify previous answers. If the two questions were somewhat redundant, suggesting that this portion of the report should be a single unit, they yet served the purpose of eliciting shades of opinion and judgment which might otherwise have been lost in a simpler phrasing. Question XXI was phrased: "Under IDEAL circumstances, what preparation in linguistics and English language study would you require of prospective secondary school teachers of English?" The companion question (XXII) asked the respondent to "Please indicate the minimum preparation you think a secondary school teacher of English should have in linguistics and English language study in order to be an effective teacher." More than half of the respondents did answer these two questions, but no tabulation is possible because the replies were in the form of small essays. Nevertheless, the answers did provide additional information about the attitudes of department chairmen, as well as specific information concerning the goals, objectives, and possible organizational patterns of preparatory programs.

As would be expected from so large a sample, the range of responses was very large and uneven. The suggested programs were, however, based on a few focal attitudes and opinions. Department chairmen were generally aware of the need for more hours of study in the linguistic disciplines. Only a few were completely hostile to such study; one respondent wrote a cryptic "None" under the question concerning an ideal preparation, and a caustic "Linguistics, hell!" was scribbled across the bottom of the page. But there were no more than a handful of such replies. Setting aside those who believe that linguistic ignorance is the ideal state of preparation, the others can be brought into a helpful focus. Two elements that most English department chairmen consider essential for an ideal preparation of English teachers are the history of the English language and grammatical analysis. Most consider it essential, moreover, that the student have a knowledge of twentieth century grammatical analysis as well as traditional-functional grammar. Slightly less than a fourth believe that a knowledge of traditional-functional grammar and a course in the history of the English language would give an ideal preparation. Almost three-fourths believe that a study of structural grammar and/or transformational-generative grammar should also be included. In general, there is a preference for a multiple preparation in grammatical analysis, including the traditional-functional, traditional-scholarly, structural, and transformational-generative approaches and, less frequently, the tagmemic and stratificational approaches.

There are three possible ways in which a knowledge of grammatical systems can be related to the ideal preparation of a prospective teacher: they may be related to his ability to analyze various linguistic corpora, to his ability to explain linguistic phenomena to his students, or to his ability to teach the systems of analysis themselves. Some English department chairmen are sensitive to the fact that grammatical analysis in the secondary schools is breaking away from its hundred-year dependence upon traditional-functional grammar. This, coupled with their own high, sometimes almost sacred, regard for "grammar," probably accounts for their consistent recommendation of multiple systems of grammar. Surprisingly, at least a third of the respondents appear to realize that, to be ideally prepared, the secondary school teacher must be a "miniature linguistic scholar," capable of utilizing grammatical systems of analysis and his knowledge of non-grammatical areas of linguistic study in order to solve everyday classroom problems. Those who realized this recommended, in addition to the commonly taught areas such as the history of the English language, semantics, and modern English grammar, that at least a third of the student's preparation be in such areas as grammatical theory, psycholinguistics, dialectology, English language for the disadvantaged, and cultural or social linguistic study. They also acknowledged the urgency of study in applied linguistics, through which the student would relate his knowledge of linguistics to the problems of analyzing and teaching literature, composition, and second languages or dialects. Approximately a fourth of the respondents suggested that, ideally, the future teacher should study some semantics.

In summary, although no strict unanimity can be found as to what constitutes the ideal linguistic and English language preparation of the prospective teacher, a majority of department chairmen agree that his education in these areas should be extensive. Chairmen display some tendency to think in terms of isolated courses in language study rather than in sequential units of study and, therefore, recommend most frequently that the prospective teacher take a course in the following areas: history of the English language, traditional-functional grammar, structural grammar, transformational-generative grammar, phonology, Middle English and Old English, semantics, composition, modern American dialects and, less frequently, applied linguistics. Many department chairmen do not conceive a distinction that may be made among analytical tools (e.g., systems of grammatical analysis, phonemics), materials to be analyzed (e.g., Old, Middle, or Modern English), and areas of study (e.g., dialectology, psycholinguistics, semantics). The impression is strong that, except for traditional-functional grammar (which many chairmen apparently recommend on the assumption that it directly improves student writing), chairmen view transformational-generative, structural, and tagmemic grammars as areas of study which are to be learned for their own sake, or in the hope that these grammars also will directly improve student writing. Thus, they generally recommend that, ideally, the student will have a mastery of all systems, including traditional-school grammar. In similar fashion, a few respondents--no more than twenty--suggested that a knowledge about the systems of analysis would be adequate.

Questionnaire Two

Project Grammar's second questionnaire was modeled closely after the first one, but differed in two respects. Questionnaire Two asked for information about the academic preparation of the respondent (Section I) and sought specific information about the contents of the linguistic and English language courses taught across the nation (Section II). Section III concentrated on "Opinions of Respondent on English Teacher Preparation and Linguistics," and largely duplicated, almost verbatim, those portions of Questionnaire One which sought the opinions and attitudes of department chairmen. However, since Questionnaire Two was sent to professors in English departments who actually teach the courses offered in linguistics and English language study, their responses could be expected to have some insights often not found in an administration-oriented chairman. Such at least was the design of this portion of Project Grammar.

Questionnaire Two went to 789 individuals in 406 institutions. A total of 333 (42.2%) persons, representing 308 (75.6%) institutions, responded. Information was received from every state in the Union, and from every size and type of institution.

Section I, "General Information Concerning Respondent," inquired into the academic background of the person replying. Of the 333 respondents, 68% have the earned doctorate, 27% have earned additional credit beyond the master's degree, 4% have earned the master's degree but no additional credit, and less than 1% have only the bachelor's degree. Literature rather than linguistics is the sole area of specialization of 63% of the persons teaching the courses in linguistics and English language study; the area of specialization for 25% was some field other than literature, linguistics, or English language study. Only eight persons (slightly over 2%) considered English language study or philology to be their sole area of specialization, and no person indicated that his sole area of specialization was linguistics. Where there was more than a single area of specialization noted, 23% of the respondents considered linguistics or English language study to be one of their areas. There was an interesting correlation between the age of the respondent and the possession of a dual specialization in English language study and literature: the average age of such professors was fifty-four. In numerous cases it was indicated that the English language or linguistics was a self-taught area, or when not self-taught, the formal training was most often in early structuralism.

Section II, "Specific Information Concerning Courses Taught," asked the respondent to discuss the course(s) he taught, in terms of the principal texts used and required or recommended reading, and especially in terms of areas of study and course objectives. The courses most frequently taught (and discussed) were, to use conventional titles for purposes of identification here, "Introduction to Linguistics," "Modern English Grammar," and "History of the English Language." In this report, they will be discussed in that order, with a suitable emphasis on areas of study and course objectives. Question 11 of Section II listed twenty-two possible areas of study, with space for additions; Question 12 listed nine course objectives, asking the respondent to select those which corresponded to the objectives of the course(s) he taught. (These two questions were similar in scope and intention to Questions XVIII and XII respectively of Questionnaire One, addressed to department chairmen.)

Section II gathered information on a total of 647 English language or linguistics courses, of which 118 were "Introduction to Linguistics" courses. In 28 such introductory courses (24%), the sole objective was instruction in one grammatical system of analysis (descriptive linguistics 13, transformational-generative grammar 10, traditional-scholarly grammar 5). In the remaining 76% of the introductory linguistics courses the objective was broader than instruction in one grammatical system of analysis. For example, in 41 courses (36%) the most frequently selected single objective was to give the students a knowledge of the major systems of grammatical analysis, both traditional and modern. In 19% of the courses, the aim was to give the students a knowledge of traditional grammar plus one or more modern systems of grammatical analysis. In 18% of the courses offered, the objective was to give the students a knowledge of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the English language from Anglo-Saxon times to the present. The term "linguistics" obviously does not have exclusively modern implications for a number of respondents.

Question 11 asked the respondent to indicate, among the twenty-two possible areas of study, whether each item was a primary or a secondary basis of instruction in his course. Each group of primary and secondary items had its own significance. In general, the majority of courses strongly emphasize structural linguistics, general and modern English phonology, and general and modern English morphology. As a primary area of study, structural linguistics was listed in 51% of the courses surveyed (118 total), while transformational-generative grammar was listed in only 25%. Traditional-functional grammar was considered a primary area of study in slightly more than 2% of the courses, and tagmemics was listed by only 1%. Among the remainder were history of the English language (12%), usage (11%), dialectology (8%), socio-cultural linguistics (8%), the physical organs of speech (8%), various modern American dialects (8%), comparative Indo-European linguistics (8%), psycholinguistics (4%), English language for the disadvantaged (3%), semantics (3%), traditional-scholarly grammar (3%), philology (3%), and geographical linguistics (2%).

But it is not so much from an examination of the primary as it is from the secondary areas of study that one receives an indication of the nature of the courses classified as an introduction to linguistics. The following areas of study were recorded as being of a secondary order in instruction in linguistics:

Various modern American dialects	26%
Dialectology	23%
Traditional-scholarly grammar (Jespersen, Poutsma, Hrusinga, etc.)	22%
The physical apparatus of speech (organs)	21%
Traditional-functional grammar	20%
Transformational-generative grammar	20%
Geographical linguistics (atlases, etc.)	20%
Semantics	18%

Lexicology	18%
History of the English language	17%
Psycholinguistics	16%
Socio-cultural linguistics	16%
The phonology of modern English	16%
The morphology of modern English	16%
Comparative linguistics (Indo-European)	15%
General phonology	15%
General morphology	14%
Tagmemic analysis	11%
Philology	11%
Descriptive linguistics	8%
English language for the disadvantaged	8%
European structuralism	7%
Other (Usage)	5%

It is difficult at best to form generalizations concerning the 118 courses recorded as "Introduction to Linguistics" courses. Viewed broadly, such a course is most often a traditional study of advanced English grammar to which has been added some early modern linguistic study, generally modern linguistics up to and including the early structuralism of Fries and Francis. Such a generalization is supported by the responses given concerning the areas of study and course objectives, and the terms and concepts which the students are reported to have mastered in the courses. Also, the required and recommended reading lists reinforce the generalization. The point is that many students had not progressed much into the era of transformational-generative grammar. Although it was generally indicated that the students would have a familiarity with transformational-generative grammar, it was actually the terms and concepts of structural linguistics that were mastered. And although there was a wide variation in the lists of required or recommended reading, the inclusion of even a relatively simple book on transformational-generative grammar was rare.

The main concentration of the typical course of "Introduction to Linguistics" was on the structure of American English as approached by Nelson Francis' *The Structure of American English*. The next most common focus for the typical course was on either the history of the English language or a general introduction to the linguistic discipline. It is evident that there is a large variance between the average English department's course in "Introduction to Linguistics" and the work of a similarly titled course in a department of linguistics. Most of the courses offered by English departments, as reflected in the responses to Questionnaire Two, end their study of modern linguistics with early structuralism, that is, with the period at which most linguistics departments usually begin their courses.

Of the 647 English language or linguistics courses reported in Section II of the second questionnaire, 291 courses can be grouped under a conventional title, "Modern English Grammar" or perhaps "Modern English Structure." The goals, as stated by the instructors of the courses, indicate that the concentration was not on the history of the English language but on the grammar or structure of modern English. Further, these courses differed from those called "Introduction to Linguistics" in that, while the latter intended to introduce students to the discipline of modern linguistics and enlarge their linguistic horizons, the courses in "Modern English Grammar" were to concentrate on the study and the analysis of a specific language, Modern English. In actuality, however, there appears to be little significant difference between the content of the two courses, "Introduction to

Linguistics" and "Modern English Grammar." Although the range of primary areas of study included in the latter course is somewhat more restricted than the primary areas of the former, the emphasis of "Modern English Grammar" being more on the study of systems of grammatical analysis, there is a similarity between the two courses' percentages in their course objectives and secondary areas of study.

Course Objective	Introduction to Linguistics	Modern English Grammar
To give the student a knowledge of the major grammatical or linguistic approaches to language analysis, including both traditional (scholarly, functional) and contemporary ones	36%	39%
To give the student a knowledge of phonology, the physical apparatus of speech, and a recognized system of phonetic transcription	30%	31%
To give the student a knowledge of both geographical and class dialects, and the social significance of their use	27%	27%
To give the student a knowledge of English grammar from a traditional (scholarly, functional) approach, as well as a basic knowledge of one or more of the new approaches to linguistic analysis (e.g., transformational-generative, American descriptivism, and the like)	19%	33%
To give the student a knowledge of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the English language from Anglo-Saxon times to the present	18%	18%
To give the student a knowledge of English grammar from a traditional (scholarly, functional) approach	7%	13%
To give the student a knowledge of only descriptive linguistics	12%	7%
To give the student a knowledge of only the transformational-generative approach to language	9%	7%
To give the student a knowledge of only traditional (scholarly, functional) approach to language	4%	6%

Secondary Area of Study	Introduction to Linguistics	Modern English Grammar
Various modern American dialects	26%	32%
Dialectology	23%	28%
Traditional-scholarly grammar	22%	28%
Physical apparatus of speech (organs)	21%	25%
Geographical linguistics (atlases, etc.)	20%	22%
Traditional-functional grammar	20%	24%
The morphology of modern English	16%	22%
The phonology of modern English	16%	21%
Transformational-generative grammar	20%	18%
Semantics	18%	19%
Lexicology	18%	18%

General phonology	15%	20%
General morphology	14%	20%
History of the English language	17%	17%
Socio-cultural linguistics	16%	18%
Comparative linguistics (Indo-European)	15%	12%
Psycholinguistics	16%	10%
Tagmemic analysis	11%	9%
Philology	11%	8%
Descriptive linguistics	8%	14%
English language for the disadvantaged	8%	9%
European structuralism	7%	3%

The secondary areas of study have a high degree of correspondence, but there is some distinction between an "Introduction to Linguistics" course and a "Modern English Grammar" course in the primary areas of study. The latter course emphasizes to a larger extent the study of grammatical systems or the grammar of modern English. In effect, this means that instead of studying a system of grammatical analysis plus a second primary area such as dialectology, thus including a second system of grammatical analysis only as a secondary area of study, the typical course in "Modern English Grammar" often emphasizes two systems of grammatical analysis as primary areas of study and includes such areas as dialectology only as secondary areas. The primary areas of study for a typical "Modern English Grammar" course are, in descending order of occurrence: descriptive linguistics (37%), transformational-generative grammar (33%), the morphology of modern English (28%), the phonology of modern English (26%), traditional-functional grammar (19%), history of the English language (13%), general morphology (11%), general phonology (10%), traditional-scholarly grammar (8%), American structuralism (an "other," 7%), the physical apparatus of speech (6%), various modern American dialects (5%), and eleven other areas of study with an occurrence of 3% down to less than 1%, namely, linguistics, comparative linguistics, philology, geographical linguistics, socio-cultural linguistics, and English language for the disadvantaged.

A passing comment may be made on the somewhat eclectic practice of the teachers of college courses in linguistics and English language study, a feature that is also present in the choices of English department chairmen. This preference for a mixture of several systems of grammatical analysis is evident in the courses in "Modern English Grammar" under consideration here. For example, in those courses in which structural grammar was a primary area of study, traditional-functional grammar and the history of the English language also were often primary areas. Yet in those courses where transformational-generative grammar was a primary area, structural grammar was sometimes a secondary area, but traditional-functional grammar was seldom included with transformational. In general, transformational-generative grammar was considered as the primary basis of study almost as often as descriptive linguistics was, but more often than not the two areas were not taught in the same course.

The degree of similarity between courses titled "Introduction to Linguistics" and "Modern English Grammar" or "Modern English Structure" leads one to believe that English departments do not, in general, teach two distinct courses in language but rather teach much the same course under two titles. Until it becomes the common practice to require two courses, one in English language study and one in linguistics, the duplication will probably not be corrected. Professors of English, with perhaps an unsteady and eclectic attitude towards the discipline of language study and linguistics, cannot hope to do their work when limited to a single semester's course. Too much information is brought to one task, and as a result the student often learns neither modern English grammar nor an introduction to linguistics.

There remains a third general "course" which is taught regularly by professors in colleges and universities. It has already been mentioned that Section II of the second questionnaire gathered information on a total of 647 English language or linguistics courses, and of this number 174 courses were concerned with "The History of the English Language." Such courses differed significantly from the two general courses already discussed, "Introduction to Linguistics" and "Modern English Grammar."

No more than 65% of the courses described by the respondents included the history of the English language as an area of primary interest, and only an additional 6% listed that area as being of secondary interest. In the remaining 30% of the courses, there was no mention that the history of the English language was included. Again, the comment might be made that professors of English often seem to have a course that they teach regardless of the name, nature, or purpose of the course as listed in the catalog. Supporting evidence may be seen in the following table, which lists the areas of study given in the questionnaire and shows the percentages of primary and secondary use of them:

Area of Study	Primary	Secondary
History of the English language	6%	30%
The phonology of modern English	16%	31%
The morphology of modern English	14%	28%
Descriptive linguistics	13%	24%
General morphology	11%	29%
General phonology	11%	37%
Traditional-functional grammar	8%	20%
Tagmemic analysis	0%	3%
Various modern American dialects	8%	40%
Dialectology	7%	36%
Semantics	6%	30%
Transformational-generative grammar	6%	22%
Lexicography	5%	21%
Philology	5%	21%
Geographical linguistics	4%	27%
Traditional-scholarly grammar	3%	21%
The physical apparatus of speech	3%	32%
Socio-cultural linguistics	2%	17%
European structuralism	1%	3%
Comparative linguistics (Indo-European)	8%	35%
English language for the disadvantaged	0%	3%
Psycholinguistics	0%	9%

From the above listing it will be seen that conventional courses in the history of the English language do not do much to instruct the student in the linguistic analysis of historic English. Only those which include descriptive linguistics or transformational-generative grammar could be said to prepare the student to make a significant investigation of a passage of historic English. One cannot investigate historic English unless one possesses a system by which to analyze it. Rather than seeking to investigate the internal history of the English language, contemporary courses study the external history (as found in a text similar to Albert Baugh's A History of the English Language), comparative Indo-European linguistics of a nineteenth-century vintage, and a functional grammar of Old and Middle English. In noting their course objectives, 58% of the respondents indicated that they sought to give the students a "knowledge of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the English language from Anglo-Saxon times to the present." And in their opinion the history of the English language has been competently outlined by the application of traditional-functional and scholarly linguistics.

Section III, "Opinions of Respondent on English Teacher Preparation and Linguistics," asked the professor of English many of the questions which had been asked of departmental chairmen in Questionnaire One. Although there are variations in the percentages, there is no significant difference between the two groups. Of course, in many instances they are the same persons. Where a difference is found to exist, however, it is often because the professor is aware of what can and cannot be accomplished in a given period of time. Some of the responses from professors follow; the questions are taken from Questionnaire Two:

Question

13 Do you believe that prospective secondary school teachers of English receive adequate training in linguistics and English language study?

Yes	13%
No	87%

14 In a four-year preparatory period for secondary school teachers of English, what is the maximum and minimum semester hours (exclusive of rhetoric courses) which should be allotted to English language study and linguistics courses?

Average maximum semester hours recommended	10.25
Average minimum semester hours recommended	5.50
Maximum mean	9
Minimum mean	6
Range of suggested maximum hours	45-2
Range of suggested minimum hours	32-2

15 Do you believe that a secondary school teacher of English should have a basic knowledge of two or more systems of English grammar (such as traditional-scholarly, transformational-generative, functional, descriptive, and the like)?

Yes	98%
No	2%

16 In your opinion, which of the following programs would provide the most desirable training for secondary school teachers of English? You may choose more than one:

One designed to give the prospective teacher a broad theoretical background in linguistics, including the modern approaches to language analysis developed over the last thirty years?	155
One that emphasizes one system of grammatical analysis but also makes the prospective teacher aware of the existence of other systems?	120

One that emphasizes one system of grammatical analysis in both its theoretical and practical aspects, and aims at developing the prospective teacher's ability to analyze English well within the framework of that one system?	63
One that does not emphasize the theoretical aspects of linguistics and English language study, but which stresses only those aspects directly related to classroom teaching?	16
One designed to correct or improve the prospective teacher's own usage habits, and aimed at establishing in him an accepted standard of language which he may teach his pupils?	46

17	In any of your classes does the prospective teacher examine and evaluate various secondary school language textbooks in regard to their linguistic basis and merit?	Yes No	49% 51%
18	Do you feel that an examination of such textbooks would be worthwhile in preparation of a secondary school teacher of English?	Yes No	95% 5%

Question 20 of Questionnaire Two stated: "Below are descriptions of possible language courses. Please give your opinion as to whether each course described, regardless of whether or not your institution offers such a course, is one which (a) should be required of prospective secondary school teachers of English, (b) should be recommended, (c) should be available/offered, (d) should be omitted because it is not of sufficient value. The course descriptions are slightly abbreviated but not changed in their language; the results given in the column are percentages.

Possible Language Courses	Require	Recommend	Offer	Omit
A course in Old English	5	17	47	31
A course in the history of the English language	62	23	13	2
A course in the history of the English language addressed specifically to the secondary school teacher of English	38	18	12	32
A normative course in advanced English grammar or syntax...as a basis for teaching	29	22	20	29
A normative course in advanced English grammar or syntax, not pedagogical	19	22	26	33
An introductory course in modern English grammar or linguistics, basically pedagogical	43	21	14	22
An introductory course in modern English grammar or linguistics which is not basically pedagogical	48	23	19	10
A course in the philosophy of language	10	30	48	12
A course in English vocabulary or lexicology	3	26	40	31

A course in phonetics	8	27	43	22
An introductory course in comparative linguistics	4	16	56	24
A course in linguistics and language learning	10	26	50	14
A course in English language study (normative approach)	5	16	22	57
A course in English for the disadvantaged	5	30	53	12
A course in rhetoric or advanced composition	49	25	16	10
A course in English language study (linguistic approach)	35	31	22	12

DISCUSSION

Five Linguistic Interviews

The interviews with linguists and educators were invaluable in clarifying misconceptions concerning the present direction and nature of the linguistic discipline, and in providing an accurate sounding board for ideas. Many of the concepts and suggestions received in this stage of the investigation are interspersed throughout the whole report, as it is not feasible to report individually on each interview. However, certain aspects of the needed linguistic preparation of the prospective teacher were discussed with each of the persons interviewed and therefore lend themselves to separate and independent treatment.

One could not hope for unanimity of opinion among the linguists interviewed; however, a consensus could be drawn concerning the language and linguistic skills that ought to be basic preparation for the secondary English teacher. First, the teacher needs a broad understanding of what language and linguistics are--their complexities, their ranges, their scopes. Second, he needs proper attitudes which come only from a basic knowledge of such fields as semantics, modern dialectology, psycholinguistics, the history of the language, lexicography, and scientific systems of analysis. Third, he must understand the interrelationships of linguistics, literary analysis, and composition. Fourth, as a basic means of investigating all the above, he must have a clear and detailed understanding of the various approaches of actual language analysis. He must be able to use any of the various systems of grammatical analysis--tagmemic, immediate constituent, or transformational--that will best illustrate what he is presenting in the classroom; and so that he can later incorporate new discoveries into his linguistic knowledge, he must understand the theoretical aspects of these systems and have practice in their use.

The most often heard justification for the exclusion of linguistics in the education of a prospective teacher of English is the statement that linguists themselves do not believe that the discipline has anything to offer English teachers, that, although it is valuable in itself, it is so far removed from the discipline of English that it need not be studied by the prospective teacher of secondary students or the English major. Only one of the linguists interviewed believed, however, that linguistics has nothing to offer the English teacher. Although some linguists do believe that a direct relationship between overt grammatical knowledge and the ability to write acceptable compositions has not been, and may never be, established, this is not to say that they also believe that no practical benefit is derived from the study of linguistics. Both linguistics and rhetoric are extremely complex, and one would hardly expect to find direct relationships between the knowledge of part of one discipline and the performance in the whole of another.

Certainly, general linguistic or grammatical knowledge will not aid in teaching a student how to organize a theme, or how to think clearly and logically; but there are areas of composition, such as the first dialect interference, the improvement of written sentence structure and patterns, the increasing of syntax complexity, and the illustration of distinctions between oral and written English, which can only be taught effectively from a linguistic base. The question is not whether there is a direct relationship between the discipline of linguistics and the performance on one aspect of or skill in writing, but whether or not linguistic knowledge can be used to improve an individual's composition skill through clarification of language conceptions or by increasing a student's control over and awareness of that creative tool, the English language. The problems that students have in writing compositions are myriad and, at best, grammatical awareness can affect only a few. Thus, although few linguists will state that the study of linguistics can be directly related to general improvement in composition, hardly any can be found who do not see its value as a pedagogical tool or who do not see some specific relationships which can be used for the practical improvement of the traditional concerns of the English teacher, reading and writing.

A second reason often given for not preparing the prospective teacher in linguistics and English language study is that there is such division and dissension in the linguistic discipline one cannot decide what to study. It would seem that the dissent has been greatly over-emphasized. Although there are disagreements, there are no more than one expects in an expanding discipline rich in intelligent minds. Certainly there is more agreement than disagreement. Often it is not that ideas are in direct conflict, but that they reflect different facets of an extremely complex discipline. There is current disagreement among linguists as to the relative value of several systems of grammatical analysis, but it is not true that the area is one of utter chaos and confusion. There is already agreement on many points.

No linguist interviewed considered traditional-functional grammar as a valid system of linguistic analysis. Whether or not an individual linguist believes that teachers should study traditional-scholarly grammar depends on how one approaches the question. Very few if any linguists would accept the substitution of the study of traditional-scholarly grammar for the study of more modern grammatical systems, or for the teaching of traditional-scholarly grammar independently of a general modern linguistic framework. Although taxonomic grammarians such as Otto Jespersen often did reach valid isolated results, they lacked the theoretical basis to formulate valid systems of analysis. Thus, instruction in traditional-scholarly grammar must be selective and taught not as a system of analysis, but rather as a series of individual, isolated insights into the nature of a specific language. Although several of the linguists interviewed suggested the need for familiarity with the results of Otto Jespersen's prolific research, it was as valuable supplementary material.

The only persons interviewed who recommended that the prospective teachers be trained in traditional-functional grammar were specialists in English or

English education, not linguists. Because traditional-functional grammar is still widely taught in secondary schools, some English education specialists thought it necessary to train the teacher in it. However, the analytic quality of traditional-school grammar is so simple that it is inconceivable that a student who has mastered transformational-generative or tagmemic analysis as well as important aspects of traditional-scholarly grammar would be unable to understand the facts and fantasies contained in most traditional handbooks. It is also inconceivable that a properly trained teacher, one able to assess the nature of the English language, would consent to teaching misconceptions and erroneous information just because they were contained in a selected textbook. Although many linguists agree that various linguistic systems of analysis (excepting traditional-school grammar) might be pedagogically compatible, it is seldom that one finds a linguist who believes them theoretically complementary. But one must remember that it is basically for pedagogical and not for theoretical reasons that the English teacher turns to systems of grammatical analysis. Too often English teachers believe that they must wait until linguists agree on which grammatical system is best before they teach any new systems.

At present there appear to be three main systems of grammatical analysis--structural, transformational, and tagmemic--competing in linguistic circles; but in reality there are but two, tagmemic and transformational-generative. If one takes careful note of recent articles, it is clearly evident that there remain as few pure structuralists as there are traditionalists in the field of English linguistics. Early structuralists such as Henry Lee Smith, Jr., Nelson W. Francis, Albert H. Marckwardt, and Harold B. Allen have all altered their conceptions of linguistic analysis over the last fifteen years. This is not to say that they have all become either transformationalists or tagmemists, but they have integrated aspects of these two theories sufficiently so that if a prospective teacher studies only their work of ten or fifteen years ago he is grossly out of date. Transformational and tagmemic theories have so modified the linguistic world that it is almost impossible for a linguist not to have been influenced by one or the other. Thus, if the prospective teacher receives instruction in traditional-scholarly grammar and in structural linguistics only, he cannot be said to be educated in modern linguistic thought.

During the interviews it became apparent that a distinction must be made between a pedagogical grammar and an analytical grammar. It would seem that an analytic grammar would be ultimately judged on its ability to penetrate and explain the functioning of a language regardless of whether or not the grammar was difficult to learn or adaptable to use as a means of answering classroom problems and questions. Thus, the best analytic grammar might not satisfy the needs of the English curriculum. The best pedagogical grammar would be one which best combines analytic power with classroom adaptability. Conceivably it might be a weaker analytic tool. It is, of course, true that a pedagogical grammar must possess analytic power, but it is not necessarily true that the grammar permits the greatest penetration into the nature of language is also most applicable to the teaching situation. The question of which system or systems of grammatical analysis to use in the preparation of the prospective teacher is an important one, but the linguists interviewed agreed that, to a certain extent, a selection of a system or systems is dependent upon the classroom needs of the English teacher and secondary school students. Thus, the basic question that the teacher of English must answer becomes a question of which of the competing grammars are best adaptable to his needs.

No one has defined the qualities of a grammatical system of analysis in relation to the needs of the English teacher, but certain qualities are obvious. First, the system must be adaptable for use on various learning levels; that is, it should be one that both the elementary and the secondary teacher, in turn, can employ in the classroom when the need arises. Second, it must be able to focus readily on both large linguistic units, such as the sentence, and small ones, such as the morpheme, and yet be capable of illustrating inter-sentence relationships. Third, it must have sufficient explanatory power to account for any language phenomena that advanced secondary school students might ask about, and yet it should allow the teacher to explain relatively simple problems without having to go through a complicated process of sentence generation. Fourth, it should be able to explain any English construction, not through isolated, disconnected examples, but by relating it to a general, systematic set of grammatical rules.

It is clear that traditional-scholarly as well as traditional-school grammars fail to meet even these basic requirements. Not only do they lack an acceptable theoretical basis, but they are unable to explain many basic aspects of the English language. Structural linguistics comes closer to meeting these requirements both because of its greater explanatory power and its adaptability to a pedagogical situation, but it has certain recognizable disadvantages. When structural grammar is taught deductively, the student too soon realizes that morphemic analysis, a basic element in the system, is unable to explain in simple fashion such common phenomena as the fact that many words have a multitude of semantic interpretations, and that some of these situations are syntactically controlled while others are not. It has long been recognized that structural grammar is unable to explain certain basic syntactic characteristics of English, and it is not able to explain inter-sentence relationships. Thus, although structural grammar is a great improvement over early grammars, it too does not meet the basic standards of a pedagogical grammar.

Most pedagogical grammars published recently are based on either structural or transformational-generative systems; however, the majority of the linguists interviewed are not satisfied with the adaptability of either system to a pedagogical grammar. In addition to the disadvantages already discussed, structural grammar as a linguistic system seems clearly to have reached its point of greatest development. The vast majority of linguists presently being educated are receiving either a transformational-generative or a tagmemic background, and it is doubtful if many, if any, recent Ph.D.'s in linguistics know only structural linguistics. As a result of this academic development, the distance between pure linguistic research and the content of current structurally based pedagogical grammars will increase. In the future, the validity of a structurally based grammar will probably seem not much greater than that of a traditional-school grammar. Thus it would seem that to instruct teachers in structural linguistics alone is to guarantee their need for re-training in the not-too-distant future.

Perhaps before discussing the validity of a pedagogical grammar which has a transformational-generative base, it would be best to make a distinction between two possible types of pedagogical grammars, one addressed to the secondary school students and the other addressed to the prospective teacher of secondary school English. Because of the various factors involved in textbook production, these two grammars may not be the same. Several of the English curriculum study centers have produced language materials which are based, for the most part, on transformational-generative theory. Regardless of whether or not transformational-generative grammar is the best pedagogical grammar from the teacher's perspective, it has been introduced into both elementary and secondary school curricula and has become an important student grammar. Because of its general adoption, any teacher must be prepared to teach it. The question, therefore, is not whether the prospective English teacher should study transformational linguistics, but is a question of how deeply he should study it and whether he should study it exclusively.

The amount of instruction to be given in the use of a transformational grammar is largely dependent on whether or not it is adaptable to classroom situations other than those found in the highly controlled English curriculum study centers; that is, does the average teacher find a transformational-generative grammar approach useful in solving classroom problems? Although it is the second most widely taught secondary school grammar, the first still being traditional-functional, many linguists, especially transformationalists, and some English education specialists, are doubtful as to the value of teaching it to all secondary school students. There are many who believe that the effort required to master transformational grammar is disproportionate to its practical value. The argument against its adoption is based on the assumption that it is too powerful an analytic tool for the needs of the secondary school student. But, regardless of whether the student studies it, can a transformational-generative grammar be used effectively by a teacher to explain the everyday, classroom language problems which arise, and to answer the questions which his students will ask? In other words, from the point of view of the teacher is it a valid pedagogical grammar?

The English curriculum study center most committed to teaching transformational grammar to secondary school students was that of the University of Oregon. Whether or not this commitment was a wise one only time will tell, but certain consequences of it are evident. While observing several pilot classes conducted by the University of Oregon, the Project Grammar observer noted that, although average or above-average students appeared to enjoy the study of transformational grammar, slower and culturally deprived students often appeared uninterested. It was also noted that average teachers had difficulty in utilizing the grammar in answering ordinary classroom questions. Thus, when a student asked questions in the composition or literature sections of the class, clearly related to language, the teacher was obliged to revert to traditional-functional grammar in an attempt to answer. Even those teachers who were considered to be most effective in the teaching of the transformational materials did not seem to be able to relate the grammar study to any other aspect of the discipline of English or to general language awareness. It was also noted at the University of Oregon, as well as at other centers, that only the best teachers were effective in the presentation of the transformational-generative materials. The above factors suggest that transformational-generative grammar may have serious limitations as a pedagogical grammar. Certainly, in its present state of development it is not a grammar which most teachers can employ in the classroom without first teaching it to their students. Potentially, however, it is a powerful analytic tool by which the well-prepared teacher can discover the answers to many of his students' questions, whether or not he uses it as a means to explain the answers.

Several linguists, including Kenneth Pike, Beryl Bailey, Robert Allen, Henry Lee Smith, Jr., and H. A. Gleason, Jr., believe that the grammatical theory best adaptable to pedagogical situations is tagmemics. Because English department chairmen and professors are generally less familiar with tagmemic theory and grammars than with those having a transformational-generative base, the following information, selected from interviews with Kenneth Pike, Beryl Bailey, Robert Allen, and Henry Lee Smith may be useful. It should not be considered as a complete introduction to tagmemics, but rather as a condensation of four interviews of an hour's duration each.

Professor Kenneth Pike developed his tagmemic theory during summer institutes in linguistics as he attempted to instruct students in such a manner as to allow them to investigate exotic languages successfully. Because of the diversity of the languages which his students would be confronted with, and the short time with which he had to work with them, he sought to give them some general principles which would aid in the analysis of any language. Thus, he sought meaningful generalities, language universals which the student could master and utilize in his analysis of any language. To explain this process, Pike created a metaphor which compared language analysis to climbing a mountain consisting of the individual characteristics of all languages. The base of such a mountain was made up of all the phonemes of all the languages, and the second level was the generalizations which would attempt to systematize these phonemes. The morphological and syntactic levels of language were treated as he moved further up the mountain. As he ascended he was always systematizing and forming generalizations. What Pike then sought was to reach the apex of linguistic generalizations, which could be used to analyze any language.

As a result of this search for language universals, he believes he passed through linguistic boundaries and reached generalizations that served not only as a method of linguistic analysis but also of analysis in general; that is, he found a method that might allow one to learn and analyze any human phenomenon. His discovery was not purely a linguistic one, but one that dealt with human behavior in general. Thus tagmemics is not a linguistic system, such as transformational-generative or descriptive linguistics, but rather it is a theory and method of analysis that can be applied to language just as it can be applied to any human learning situation. One can develop a tagmemic rhetoric, a tagmemic physics, a tagmemic linguistics (broken down to a tagmemic analysis of any individual language), or a tagmemic theory of literature. As a result, when one talks of tagmemics a distinction must be made immediately as to whether one is referring to tagmemics as a general theory or as applied to a particular discipline.

According to Professor Pike, a tagmemic analysis and approach to language analysis has a characteristic that no other theory allows--that of diversity. One can do more with it than with any other theory. It allows one to take into account all other linguistic theories, and yet design a theory and methodology for whatever aspect of language one wishes to investigate. Other theories allow the student to approach language from one perspective only. In the end, they produce generative or structural linguists rather than a person who is diversified enough to approach language from various perspectives. It is this diversity that allows one to approach language from differing points of view simultaneously. One can analyze a language or a portion of it as a particle, as if it were independent from all else; then look at it again as a wave, in a temporal or lineal framework, examining where it started and where it might go; and then as a field, in its relation to the general pattern of the phenomenon. Specifically, in relation to language, this means that one is allowed to investigate, diachronically and synchronically as well as comparatively, using the same theory of analysis and at the same time.

Pike does not believe that one needs a course in tagmemic theory in order to learn tagmemics; rather, one approaches any subject matter using a tagmemic method and learns the subject and the theory at the same time. Although such an approach appears chaotic on the surface, it is, in reality, organized. The student is allowed to approach the subject matter directly without learning a complicated methodology or theory and, therefore, is able to learn it more rapidly than by any other method. The student himself forms his own generalizations concerning the nature of the material as well as the theory of analysis. Tagmemics draws upon the individual's personal realms of experience to explain and relate phenomena. Of course, the more raw materials the student and teacher have to draw upon, the quicker they can learn and the deeper can be the comparisons and contrasts which they can make.

Pike is writing a book to be used in freshman rhetoric classes, but its direction is away from linguistics. He believes that instruction in writing can be approached not so much by teaching linguistics but by using a tagmemic theory applied to its unique subject matter. He is also writing a book that can be used to instruct teachers in tagmemics; that is, to give them the means of approaching the analysis of a language on their own. His view of language is similar to that of Harold B. Allen in that it is humanistic and not separated from the other aspects of the discipline of English. He wants to prepare the prospective English teacher in such a way that the teacher can flexibly approach any sector of language--phonology, syntax, morphology, language in culture, and the like--rather than through the memorization of predetermined informational blocks.

Professor Beryl Bailey of Yeshiva University stated that tagmemic analysis is the only system which she has found useful in teaching students whose native language is not English or whose home dialect is not that of standard English. She referred specifically to Robert Allen's sector analysis (basically a tagmemic grammar approached from a pedagogical perspective) as having distinct advantages over a purely transformational approach. Unlike transformational analysis, tagmemic, sector-analysis grammar allows the isolation and explanation of structures smaller than the sentence. A second important feature of this tagmemic-based approach is that it allows one to work directly and immediately on the surface structure of the language without having to go through a long, complicated process of generation. These two qualities, the ability to readily isolate and emphasize non-independent structures and the early analysis of the surface structures, seem essential to an effective pedagogical grammar.

The basic unit of transformational grammar is the kernel sentence, an independent structure; and even when structures smaller than the sentence are treated, they are always analyzed within the framework of the S→NP + VP. Although the phrase structure analysis of NP eventually accounts for all constructions that appear before VP, the NP of any given sentence must be analyzed in terms of its complete and sequential development; that is, to treat any given NP the student must learn the machinery that generates all NP's. A generative grammar accounts for and generates all the well-formed sentences of a language, but because of the very nature of its analytical system, the surface structure--that element with which the teacher often must work--is the last element to be treated. It is always viewed as a resultant product of the deep structure plus some operative rules, such as, transformation, deletion, and the like. It is extremely difficult for an amateur linguist and often not rewarding, critics say, to focus attention on structures smaller than the sentence or on surface structures. In short, there is an immediacy lacking in transformational grammar that is found in a tagmemic one.

A third advantage of a tagmemic grammar is that it directly relates form and function. The teacher can not only work within a consistent and accurate system of analysis, but he can readily explain such relationships as subject, verb, and direct object. The grammar aids him in identifying these parts in various ways, and in the surface manipulation of the structures they compose. Because a tagmemic grammar makes this analysis readily accessible and obvious, the teacher does not have to resort to the deep structure each time a student writes a sentence such as "I did never see her over there" or "The squirrel ran when he saw or heard me coming up the nearby tree."

There are other advantages that a tagmemic grammar has over a transformational one as a pedagogical device. One that was mentioned, not only by Professor Bailey but also by Mark Lester of the Hawaii English Curriculum Study Center, is that the basic theory of transformational grammar is still very much developing, making it impossible to write a pedagogical transformational grammar that will remain theoretically sound even for a few years. One written three years ago would not have taken into account distinctive features, and one written now cannot foresee how great the reduction of the phrase structure rules will be. In addition to this, it is not a system that is amenable to the amateur linguists and neophyte teachers. Because a very high degree of linguistic sophistication is required in order to work out on-the-spot analyses, the teacher must rely on previous professional insights, and these have yet to be written in even semi-complete transformational reference works of English syntax. In other words, the teacher could well be placed in a position of not being able to use the system adequately and yet having no readily accessible work of reference to consult. He would also have little recourse to new discoveries that might aid him in the classroom--though this criticism is applicable to any developing grammar.

In addition to these points, Professor Bailey raised an important question regarding a theoretical assumption concerning transformational grammar and non-standard dialect speakers. Fundamentally, her question calls into doubt the theory that all dialects of English have the same deep structure. Transformationalists presently generate the dialectic deviant forms and those of standard English from identical deep structures. This means that, with a few more or a few less rules, a transformational grammar of standard English is also a grammar of non-standard speech. Thus, if a dialect speaker understands the deep structure of his dialect, he will also know the deep structure of standard English. He then needs only to be made aware of the rules which operate to generate his deviant constructions. If this is true, it would be a useful step in bi-dialect training and would relieve the classroom teacher of the necessity of writing a transformational grammar for his non-standard speakers--an ordeal that no secondary school English teacher could be expected to undergo. But all direct aid to the teacher is dependent upon the assumption that the deep structures of the dialects of English are identical. Professor Bailey suggests at least two points where they differ and believes that their radically different surface structures cannot be the product of identical deep structures, especially if one is to consider the grammar as an approximation of the psychological process. If these objections are valid, then the Negro speaker learning transformational-generative grammar would be learning the deep structure of standard English, not that of his own dialect. That this would be of posssible value to him is dependent upon a transfer of learning. The dialect speaker--and everyone speaks a dialect--must compare his dialect's structure, individually and abstractly, with the one he has learned, and then transfer this comparison to practice. In reality, this assumes that either he or his teacher is going to do a transformational grammar of the dialect, or that the learning transfer will be automatic. Both are most feeble assumptions.

The above objections do not attack the validity of transformational grammar as an analytic system. Rather, Professor Bailey objects to it when it is advocated as a complete pedagogical grammar. Even in this function it is not completely rejected, because tagmemic analysis incorporates aspects of transformational grammar. Professor Bailey and Professor Pike both reject the statement that tagmemic and transformational analysis are in conflict with each other. They see them as complementary systems which have different objectives, systems which are moving, as theories, closer and closer together.

Robert Allen's sector analysis differs from Kenneth Pike's tagmemic system in that it is a pedagogical adaptation of the tagmemic theory. In Professor Pike's tagmemic analysis, one is more aware of the slot and the filler (the tagmeme) and the labeling of them than in sector analysis, which shifts the emphasis from an analytically labeled system to the process of analysis.

Sector analysis allows the student to form grammatical generalizations early, through manipulation of surface structures, without his having to learn terminology. Thus it is a reversal of the transformational approach in that it works from the general, the surface structure, back into the deeper, embedded structures. One of the results of a sector-analysis approach is that at the same time it analyzes it gives the student practice in surface structure manipulation. A simple example of this is the identification of subjects through movement of the verb in the statement-and-question transforms.

He was there.	Was he there?
In the morning he was there.	Was he there in the morning?

The subject is always the element which immediately follows the transposed verbal.

Professor Henry Lee Smith, Jr., has developed a tagmemically based theory and system of analysis which he believes is now, though originally dependent upon the work of Kenneth Pike, without the reliance on referential meaning that Pike and his disciples follow. As is generally true in tagmemic analysis, there were at the times of the interviews no classroom texts and little published material based on Smith's analytic system.

There are fundamental *theoretical differences* between the tagmemic theory of Professor Smith and that of transformational-generative linguists. Transformationalists often publicly make two claims which Smith seriously challenges. The first is that the only linguistic system which can adequately account for the infinite number of possible English sentences is transformational-generative analysis (through its processes of generation of kernel sentences and the transformational and rewrite rules working on these kernel sentences). The second is that the transformational process is similar to, if not identical with, the human mental process of sentence production. Smith believes that the first claim is simple misrepresentation and that the second is an untenable position in that it forces facts to fit theory, resulting in a metaphysical rather than a scientific statement. Smith believes that it is not important to have a theory that "generates" all sentences, but rather to have a system that can account for, that is, describe, any given English sentence once it is produced.* This is in one sense a taxonomic approach to linguistic analysis and therefore open to attack on the grounds that its results will be restricted to the corpus investigated. But any linguist--tagmemic or transformational-generative--has, if he is a native speaker, the same infinite corpus from which to draw his generalizations.

---

* A distinction must be made between the method of arriving at the analytic system and the resultant system's power to analyze a corpus. Any linguist is restricted to a corpus in the establishment of his system. Even a transformationalist must originally and ultimately depend on his native intuition about English or that of a native informant. A principal, and valid, objection against older taxonomic grammars was that the corpus was often a mixture of archaic English excerpts and poor novels. This cannot be used as an indictment of the objection of Professor Smith.

Professor Smith has been concerned with the problem of establishing an analytic system that can describe any given English segment, but he does not believe that one can legitimately establish the points that one sentence is a transformation of another (making one primary and the other secondary), that any sentence is generated from a deep structure, or that the analytic system represents in any way the human process of language production. This conflict with transformational theory is not one of descriptive method or range for both systems attempt to explain relationships which obviously exist between pairs of constructions, such as the active-passive and the declarative-interrogative relationships. It is rather a conflict over what might be called the metaphysical aspects of transformation theory; that is, its claims to being an accurate representation of the internal human grammar--to whatever extent such claims are made.

A second theoretical conflict between the two systems is seen in the respective positioning of phonology. There is little doubt that the transformational theory, considering as it does the phonological and morphological elements of the language as mainly dependent upon syntactic selection and production, is primarily concerned with syntactic problems. Many transformationalists, when asked why such great emphasis is placed upon this one level of language system, say that it is the primary language level (the selection of morphemes and phonemes being dependent on syntactic selection), and that what often appears to be a phonological or morphological problem is, in truth, a syntactic one. Smith denies this. He believes that there is no such overpowering syntactic dominance. These elements, as well as the concept of the morphophone and sememe, must be considered as interacting in a more equal way. He states that it is impossible, legitimately, to consider syntax without extensive phonological investigation and without accounting for the interacting of the various levels.

In answer to the claim often made by transformational linguists, that no other system is able to explain all English sentences or to describe such relationships existing between sentences as active-passive, question-statement, and the like, Professor Smith demonstrates how this is simply not true. His tagmemic analysis does explain and account for these relationships, even though it does not establish a primary-secondary, kernel-transformation relationship. Rather than saying that one sentence is a transform of another, his method of analysis simply notes the systems of relationship existing between sentences. He demonstrates how it is able to distinguish between such stock sentences as:

1. John is easy to please
2. John is eager to please
3. John is stupid to please
4. John is happy to please

and how his theory is able to explain why there exist passive transforms of sentences 1 and 3 (It is easy to please John. It is stupid to please John.), but not of 2 and 4 (*It is eager to please John. *It is happy to please John.).

The tagmemic explanation of these sentences is similar to one given by a transformationalist; that is, syntactic selection based on the marking and non-marking of certain morphemes which allow or prohibit combinations. In this instance, the basic difference between the systems is not in the explanation but in the fact that tagmemic analysis does not depend on transformation rules to establish these distinctions. Here, of course, a transformationalist might attack the grammar as violating the basic rule of simplicity, but since that is in origin a transformationalist's qualification, it might not be a valid attack.

As in all tagmemic systems of analysis, there is a concern with the inner relationship of sentences and clauses that were previously described separately in such terms as relationships among subject, predicate, direct object, and indirect object. The problem is one of combining this information--certainly a valid part of any analysis--with a more general syntactic description, and without the result being a mere gluing together of separate and distinct views of linguistic analysis. It is this aspect of tagmemic analysis that makes it such a desirable pedagogical grammar.

Professor Smith is writing a historical grammar of English based upon his adapted tagmemic theory. As he described some of his findings, it became increasingly clear that the resultant information would not only be significantly different from the conventional history of the English language, but also from any accepted historical assumptions. One can only imagine how different our conception of various stages of the language may be after the phenomena have been re-examined through the use of a more accurate analytic tool. Certainly our conception of the nature of historical English must be at least as much in error as was our pre-1930 conception of the nature of modern English.

Although tagmemic analysis contains many of the aspects of transformational-generative grammar (for example, a system for describing the relationships between sentences, a morphemic and phonemic marking system which resembles distinctive feature analysis, and a system of formulae which gives precise and abbreviated descriptions of any given utterance), it has distinct advantages over the transformational grammar in regard to ease of pedagogical application. Although transformational grammars do treat phonology and morphology, these aspects are treated in the later stages of the analysis. The teacher needs ready access to all aspects of the language. The true emphasis of transformational analysis is upon syntax, and although this is often the element that the teacher wishes to deal with, it is by no means the only level on which he must work. It would be difficult to establish that, for classroom purposes, syntax is the most valuable tool; it is often the more indirect method of explaining a point in question. Because of its very nature, tagmemic analysis allows the teacher to work on many levels simultaneously. It is also possible that the way in which transformational-generative grammar is often approached might cause the prospective teacher to further remove himself from an interest in applied linguistics. Once working within the system, he turns to his language only as a fireman would to coal--a brief glance at its mass, and another shovelful of raw material can be stoked into the analytic furnace.

On the other hand, one argument supporting a tagmemically based linguistic preparation of secondary school English teachers is that in such a program the student would be introduced to many of the techniques of transformational grammar as well as structuralism, but if he were to study either of the other theories exclusively, he would learn, obviously, only transformational grammar or structural grammar. Those concerned with teacher preparation are generally not linguistically sophisticated enough to decide which system of grammatical analysis is theoretically most valid, and, as a result, their decision must be based on a judgment of which system will give the teacher the broadest base from which to continue his study.

The Experimental Classes

The long section that follows is a description of three experimental courses taught at Illinois Wesleyan as a result of this project, plus a description of a freshman course inspired by the project but not actually a part of it.

The three courses were devised as a result of the earlier parts of the study and based upon the conclusion that intensive study of the English language is of great potential value to the prospective English teacher. The description is intended only to show what one institution did. Professors in other institutions may react variously to the Illinois Wesleyan courses, saying that they are too thorough, not thorough enough, too eclectic, too dependent upon one grammatical system, too indifferent to another system, too arbitrary, or inadequate in presentation of some element such as lexicography, dialectology, semantics, usage, etymology, or something else. The investigators will readily grant that some other combination of content and emphases may indeed prove superior to the Wesleyan plan. Nevertheless, the Wesleyan courses do represent one reasoned solution to the problem of the nearly universal inadequacy of English teacher preparatory programs in study of the language.

It is a cheerless truth that to be adequately prepared, the secondary school English teacher must be far better trained in linguistics and English language than his university counterpart. Although the university teacher of English is theoretically knowledgeable in both areas of his discipline, language as well as literature, generally the most recent linguistic knowledge required of a university professor is Grimm's and Verner's laws. On the other hand, the secondary school English teacher, by the very nature of his students' needs, encounters language and its problems more directly than any other teacher. Not only must he contend with significant variation among dialects as well as the unsolved problems in usage and reading, but he finds many language matters peculiar to his own curriculum. At the very time that higher standards, often such non-linguistic ones as organization, rhetorical effect, interest, coherence, novelty, use of supporting details and conciseness, are set for student writing, the syntactic and structural variance between a student's speech and his rhetorical style is increasing, thus making it more and more dangerous for him to rely on his previous guide for his written sentence structures, his intuitive grammar. The secondary teacher must be able to understand and explain, therefore, areas of conflict and concord between oral and formal written English and yet do so in such a way as to avoid banishing completely the grammatical creativity of language from the student's writing.

But in addition to the problems arising from the inter-relationships between language and composition, there are other secondary school language encounters that make it important that a secondary school English teacher be cognizant of modern linguistics. It is in the secondary school that students are first required to read works written in Middle and Early Modern English. Unless the teacher is able to guide them in understanding the differences between the language of these periods and his own, it is almost impossible for the student to fully appreciate some of our greatest authors. Secondary school is also, for many students their first and last opportunity to broaden their concepts concerning the nature of language as well as to investigate their own language patterns and attitudes. After secondary school, even if they attend college, their linguistic interests and attitudes will too often remain unaltered throughout their lives. For these and a multitude of other encounters, each one uniquely associated with an individual student's needs, the secondary school English teacher must possess specific analytic abilities, skills, proper attitudes, and a breadth and depth of linguistic sophistication which is not presently required of his university colleagues--useful though it might be for them, too.

It has been seriously suggested--sometimes even by linguists--that, because linguistic theory appears to be in flux, the linguistic preparation of the secondary school teacher should be suspended until a monolithic theory of grammatical analysis once more emerges. Such a suggestion is based on an erroneous conception of the nature of the discipline of English as well as that of modern linguistics. Unless the dark ages of ignorance return, linguistic investigation will never again be monolithic and never again will linguists seek the universally valid analytic theory. The linguist as a scientist deals with phenomena in much the same manner as the physicist and biologist. He recognizes that his discoveries, theoretical or analytical, will be soon supplanted by others, and that there will always exist competing theories and modes of analysis for the phenomena. In physics, there are conflicting theories concerning the nature of light and other phenomena, yet no sensible person would recommend that physics be suspended from the preparatory program of a secondary school science teacher until one true theory is discovered. In language study and linguistics theory, it must be assumed that our knowledge will change, often radically, as we learn and discover more; it is only when the limited views of traditional-functional grammar are retained that one thinks the apex of language research has been reached. Thus, if we are to wait until ultimate linguistic knowledge has been attained, prospective teachers will never receive adequate training.

In its ideal state, the discipline of English encompasses both language and literature, and to emphasize research and study in one area to the detriment of the other must be harmful to both. For all too long, college English departments have been over-emphasizing the study of literature. As a result, not only have they produced little significant research on the nature of language in general, or English in particular, but they have refused to incorporate the linguistic scholarship of the last hundred years. Certainly the major factor in the perpetuation of traditional-school grammar has been the college English departments' continuous, uncritical support of the long-disproved tenets of that discipline, and their inability to teach prospective teachers any knowledge about language except pre-Jespersenian linguistics. Perhaps the present chaotic state of composition teaching is to a large extent due to the divorce of significant language study from the college English curriculum, and to the resulting barren and sterile training that English teachers have received in the linguistic branch of their discipline. Those who believe that further time should be dissipated in waiting for the return of the monolithic theory reveal their inability to grasp the tremendous abundance of the field and their unawareness of the present disastrous preparation of the secondary school teacher in this important area of the discipline of English.

A seemingly more legitimate suggestion--that linguistic and English language training be postponed until an adequate modern grammar is written--is based on a misconception similar to those mentioned above; namely, that once an adequate grammar is written, secondary school English teachers will be able to look up the answer to any particular point that troubles them. The day of the one-volume, all-inclusive grammar of English passed with Jespersen, and in all probability the adequate eight-volume grammar became extinct with the publication of Noam Chomsky's Syntactic Structures. For a good many years to come, if the English teacher wishes to know something about any particular corpus, he must be able to analyze it himself. To do this, he must possess not only accurate analytic tools but the proper attitudes toward language and its analysis, which come only from a study of modern linguistics. But even were there to be written in the near future an adequate reference grammar of English, linguistic training for the teacher would still be necessary. He is responsible not just for the grammatical training of his students, but for their complete introduction to the world of language. He must certainly possess more than merely analytic tools.

Many of those who are charged with the training of English teachers have vociferously complained that departments of linguistics do not offer the type of courses most suitable for the English major to take. For the most part, this is undoubtedly true, but perhaps it is not the responsibility of the departments of linguistics to train English teachers. After all, if the discipline of English does not wish to abdicate utterly the study of the English language, it must at least be prepared to educate its own secondary school teachers suitably. If one realizes that it is possible to begin a linguistic major as an undergraduate and continue through the doctorate degree without ever learning a foreign language--as learning a foreign language is traditionally conceived--then he must also realize that great attention to selection of material must be made if the limited amount of time that the prospective teacher spends studying linguistics is to be most valuable. Only a department that understands the demands of both disciplines can legitimately decide what language study will be most valuable to the English teacher. It is much more realistic to conceive of English departments being cognizant of linguistics than it is to expect linguistic departments to delve deeply enough into the discipline of English--in order to know what part of their discipline is most useful to the prospective teacher. As a result, by the very nature of things, English departments are the logical candidates for having primary responsibility for the linguistic area of the teacher's preparation.

If, as was previously seen, the English language courses customarily taught are incompatible with both modern language study and the goals of teacher preparation, what is to replace them? It was the purpose of the experimental classes, carried on as part of this project, to establish a fundamental framework more compatible with the prospective teacher's needs, and to provide a course of study that college English teachers in the future might build upon. It was felt that the course recommendations would not necessarily be new to linguists, but might well aid English department chairmen and professors, especially those who have only minimal formal training in linguistics.

The experimental classes were intended to establish an ordering of selective linguistic material thought to be valuable for the prospective secondary school English teacher and through actual classroom teaching of the material, to uncover some of the various pedagogical problems that might arise. The objective was not primarily to discover previously unknown techniques or even a statistical, scientific testing of the ones employed. Rather, it was an empirical investigation of the suggestions, ideas, and concepts which were gathered during the previous investigatory steps. The courses were organized to teach what it was felt must be taught if future English teachers were to be prepared adequately, and to do so within the present framework of restrictions existing in most schools. The primary goal was to present to institutions and department chairmen who felt the need of practical assistance a tested linguistic sequence which could be taught to both teaching and non-teaching English majors.

The three upper-level courses were conducted during the regularly scheduled academic year. Two of the courses met three times a week for a normal sixteen-week semester and one met three times a week for a twelve-week semester. Since no attempt was made at selective enrollment, students who took the courses were of mixed interests, intelligence, and scholastic abilities. The majority of the students were either English or drama majors and generally, but not necessarily, prospective secondary school English teachers. A few non-liberal arts majors--e.g., nursing, business--were enrolled in each course. Class size was between twenty-seven and thirty-five each semester. The students ranged from freshman to senior with the majority of students being either juniors or seniors. Illinois Wesleyan University does not offer a graduate degree in English and so the courses were addressed entirely to undergraduates. All the students were native speakers of English. There were no students in the class who spoke a non-standard dialect, although there were three who had originally done so when they were children. None of the students had previously taken any college level courses in linguistics or English language study nor had any taken any grammar but traditional-functional in their secondary school years. In short, the classes were probably very similar to any that might be taught across the country.

The learning situation was primarily inductive, and only when a new area was being introduced were the classes dominated by the lecture method. In general, problem-solving and question-answer approaches were employed. At the beginning of each course it was emphasized that everyone was beginning in the same state of ignorance and that grades would be open until after the final exam--i.e., until the very last it was possible to receive an A. It was also emphasized that the process and ability to do linguistic analysis was the final goal. Facts were important only in that they would aid in asking questions and reaching conclusions. Attendance was not required, although students were told that daily class participation was a factor in their final grades. There were no more absences than would normally be expected. It was also emphasized that students would be judged on their ability to analyze language, not their English prose style.

Because one of the primary aims of linguistic and language preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher is to break through the mental restrictions and convince the student that he is capable of meaningful analysis, he must not feel that knowing the correct answer is the only important aspect of his studies. His skill in investigating language is important. There easily can be too great an emphasis placed on teaching the right answer when often the answer is dependent upon the perspective and the system of analysis used. The situation is analogous to learning a skill such as a foreign language. At all times the student must be aware of exactly where his reasoning or analysis has gone awry and he must believe that his next performance is more important than his last. Thus, the quizzes, problem sheets, and tests were graded closely and errors were explained, but the impression was always given that they were much more important as a teaching tool rather than as a testing one. It was believed that college students were mature enough to accept this type of grading and would realize that they could not successfully cram the last night.

As a result of administrative and scheduling difficulties, after the first course was taught the remaining ones could not be scheduled in such a way as to have a separate course for those students who were in their second semester of linguistic preparation. It was, however, possible for the instructor to meet these students at a separately scheduled time. In actuality, the second and third courses were split into two courses each, resulting in three level-one courses, two level-two courses, and one freshman-level course being taught.

There were four basic assumptions concerning the needed linguistic preparation of the future high school English teacher which guided the teaching of the experimental classes. The first was that if he is to be an effective teacher, he must be knowledgeable of more than just systems of grammatical analysis. He must have a multifarious preparation in language, one that interlaces the factions of the linguistic discipline and supplies a basic, exact understanding of the various current systems of grammatical analysis, and theories of language study. Were he prepared but in systems of grammatical analysis, he would be only slightly better off than his predecessor of a hundred years ago who thought he had reached the pinnacle of linguistic knowledge when he could parse every sentence. In addition to the acquisition of a workable knowledge of various legitimate grammatical systems as well as a basic understanding of the history of the English language, one of the principal goals of the linguistic preparation of the prospective English teacher must be to introduce him to the world of language--the worlds of semantics, dialectology, philology, lexicology, psycholinguistics, socio-cultural linguistics, English language for the disadvantaged, the phonology and morphology of modern English, and various modern American dialects.

The second assumption was that not a general knowledge of grammatical systems but a working ability to analyze language corpora is needed. The secondary school teacher confronts English at various historical stages of development, but seldom in a purely theoretical way. He must always be prepared to explain to his students any individual linguistic phenomena and be capable of analyzing it himself. Not only must he do on-the-spot analysis, but he must be able to see the student's point of misunderstanding and be capable of clarifying it as simply as possible. To do this he must be able to approach a corpus from varying perspectives. In reality, the high school English teacher must be an amateur linguist capable of investigating, explaining, utilizing language to the best effect in his teaching.

The third basic assumption was that the material should be taught inductively. Although it is only through a knowledge of specific facts that language complexities become clear, it must be realized that the process of linguistic analysis and not the final, absolute answer is most important for the secondary school English teacher to learn. In the end he must be able to reach by himself acceptable answers, for he will encounter problems for which there are no discovered analyses. Thus it is not mere linguistic fact that is important for the teacher to know; he must be taught how to discover facts independently. Given the same corpus as the original investigator, he should be able to reach similar conclusions. Only an inductive problem-solving method of instruction offers this learning possibility.

The fourth assumption was that for pedagogical purposes there is a basic division between linguistics as a field of study and linguistics as a tool. The teacher must learn linguistic tools--e.g., structural, transformational-generative, or tagmemic grammar--which are then to be used to investigate the phenomena of English. The mastery of the analytic tool must be basic in the preparation of future English teachers. After it has been mastered, it can be applied to any linguistic corpus. Thus tagmemic, structural, transformational-generative, stratificational, and traditional-scholarly grammars are but tools that are to be applied to dialects, historic periods of English, literature, problems of ambiguity, questions of textual analysis, and various problems in composition. Analytic tools of language should not be taught as ends in themselves.

The linguistic equipment of the secondary school English teacher should consist of:

1) The proper objective attitudes towards language and its study

2) A wealth of specific facts which he himself has discovered concerning language

3) A master tool that can be employed to make other tools which will aid him in his teaching

4) Practice in using the master tool

5) An awareness of the various situations and areas to which the tool can be applied

6) A means of adapting his analytic tool as his knowledge of modern linguistics and language increases or as new discoveries in the discipline are published

Because the primary purposes of the experimental classes were to unearth possible difficulties in the teaching of linguistic material to prospective English teachers and to discover an effective ordering of such material, the classroom procedures of the courses taught at Illinois Wesleyan University are of secondary importance. What is of more import are the observations and recommendations stemming from the project's total investigation. For this reason, this section does not contain a detailed discussion of the various courses which were taught, but rather is a listing of observations noted when teaching them. Perhaps at least some of them will be of practical value.

Students expect to learn many different things when they enroll in their first course in linguistics. Although one ambitious junior informed the instructor that he was eagerly looking forward to the parsing and snipping of sentences, probably the majority of the students in the first "General Language and Linguistics" course simply wondered if modern English grammar was to be as dull as old English grammar. A few students were prospective second generation English teachers and, being able to recognize "good grammar," were taking the course in anticipation of raising their grade point average without increasing their accustomed number of study hours. It is safe to say that an introductory class in linguistics is nothing like students expect. The wonder, amazement, glee, resentment, and anger which are evident during those first combative weeks of linguistic investigation are difficult to explain to professors who have never taught a course in linguistics or English language study from other than a traditional-functional point of view.

In each introductory course there was a period similar to that which characterizes a beginning class in foreign language study--a period when many students are completely lost and can perceive only confusion and chaos. In an introductory linguistics course this confusion and mystification results from the study of new materials which often contradict cherished beliefs, and the fact that most liberal arts majors view scientific and objective study of language with initial alarm. As one English major said, he took the course not to establish phonemes and investigate syntactic structures but to study the fundamental nature of things, to reach the essence of the universe through meditation and the contemplation of the true meaning of words. Such students find it difficult to understand why one cannot begin the course with a study of semantics or where the objective, analytic study of language will lead. Yet it is important that students be able to come to terms with the investigatory techniques so that they can achieve personally satisfying results by mid-semester. If not, there is a danger of their losing the interest and enthusiasm necessary for proper linguistic investigation.

Because three introductory sections of "General Language and Linguistics" were taught, it was possible to try out various means of hastening the needed linguistic readjustment and thus reducing to a minimum the student's initial confusion. At first it was thought that the student's understanding or lack of understanding of the relationship between his previous traditional-functional training and modern linguistics might be a factor in his refusal to readily accept the new attitudes and techniques of investigation. With this in mind, one course initially ignored the conflicts between the two systems, another emphasized them, and a third attempted to utilize those few truths of traditional-functional grammar in order to begin gently the study of modern linguistics. None of the various approaches hastened or retarded the students' eventual progress, although they generally found the contrast more interesting than the comparison, and the conflict more stimulating than the adaptation. What was significant, however, was the use of linguistic problem-solving as a teaching technique. Students are better able to function while existing in that seemingly necessary state of uncertainty--which appears to be the natural by-product of learning a subject so distinct from their previous training--if they are able to work with specific problems. Those who consistently completed the problem sheets progressed much more rapidly than those who did not. There also seemed to be a definite correlation between the number of problems the student worked and the grades he received on his exams and final paper.

Considerable flexibility concerning the nature and number of the problems required was important. Each sheet attempted to include problems written on four different levels of difficulty. The easiest ones required students only to recall solutions reached in class discussions; those on the second level of difficulty required students to have absorbed their basic readings and to have associated them with important class discussions; those on the third level of difficulty required students to solve problems which were a combination of ones similar to those discussed in class and found in the assigned readings; and, finally, the most difficult problems were those which required original investigation and thought. These four types were assigned different points, the highest number of points being given for those which required original thought. Students were allowed to do any combination that would total no more than sixty points; a total of forty-five points on each sheet was considered an A. The distribution on each sheet was such that students were required to do at least problems on the third level of difficulty or one on the fourth in order to receive an A. Such a grading system allowed students to make intelligent guesses--a needed quality in linguistic analysis--without being stringently penalized. It was assumed that they would learn more from attempting to solve difficult problems than from solving only those which could be done without thought. If a student received more than forty-five points, the excess could be used to compensate for a low quiz or examination grade. A great many of the problems used were modifications of those found in standard texts, but as the year progressed student questions added to the problem fund.

A typical problem sheet dealing primarily with phonemic analysis is given below. All problem sheets were given out on Monday and students had until Friday to complete them. They were corrected and returned before the next sheet was assigned.

General Language and Linguistics

Problem Sheet I

Directions: You may do up to fifty points. You must do at least one problem from Group II and one from Group III. Groups II and III are more difficult, so think more before answering. You may select any other problems you wish. Remember that your proof is often as important as your answer. Read the question carefully. (Forty correct points is an A.)

GROUP I (5 points)

1. Disprove the statement that the English phonemic system contains all possible sounds.
2. Using original examples, establish the English vowel phonemes.
3. Establish the English phoneme /t/ and at least one of its allophones.
4. Prove or disprove the statement that a phoneme is always pronounced the same way.

GROUP II (10 points)

5. Account for the fact that the sentence "The wind blew down the chimney." is ambiguous when written but not in speech.
6. Is the assertion that stress determines the meanings of the words black bird, blackbird and round house, roundhouse correct? If not, what is the function of stress in this situation?
7. Establish, using original examples, pitch, stress, and juncture as phonemic in English, and prove that vowel length is not phonemic in English.
8. Give a complete phonological explanation of the fact that the morphemes {in} and {en} appear as [in] and [im] in such words as impossible, imbalance, embellish, and empower.

GROUP III (15 points)

9. What English phonemes can be established from the following sentences? Explain why they can be established.

   I scream for everyone in the white house.
   Ice cream for everyone in the White House.

10. Are the underlined units in the sentences identical? If not, exactly how do they differ? If they differ, explain why a native speaker recognizes this difference between them and not between the /t/ in brought and writes.

He brought the blue book not the yellow one.
He always writes his exams in a bluebook.

11. A traditional-school grammar usually groups the following words together as examples of the same noun plural rule. In light of what you have learned, is it an accurate classification? Explain your answer.

    hero - heroes
    box - boxes
    match - matches
    bench - benches
    church - churches

12. Give a critical evaluation of the grammar from which the following statements and rules are taken. (You may evaluate the accuracy of the statements, but you should also use them as a springboard to critically discuss the type of grammar they are taken from.)

    a. Proper nouns are written with capital letters; common nouns are written with small letters.

    b. For practical purposes, nouns are either common or proper.

    c. When a monosyllabic noun ends in fe, one sometimes changes the f to v in forming the plural.

       knife - knives
       wife - wives

    d. When a noun ends in y preceded by a consonant, one changes the y to i and adds es.

       lady - ladies

    e. Our only difficulty with complete sentences comes when we write. We usually speak in complete sentences without much difficulty.

    f. No one is likely to be imprisoned for saying "It's me," but it is best to be correct and to know why it is correct.

    g. No one can be said to know the grammar of his language unless he can parse every sentence.

13. Explain specifically why the following words appear strange in English. (Assume that they are written in a phonemic alphabet.) Impress me with your knowledge of new terminology.

    schnal ogchrul duradht mhaith

The grading system employed in any course is always the prerogative of the individual professor and each person undoubtedly has a belief in his own fairness; therefore, the following comments on a possible grading procedure for the recommended course entitled "General Language and Linguistics" must be interpreted as a mere suggestion. In such an introductory course it is advantageous that grades remain open as long as possible. If possible, the student should believe that he can receive the highest grade possible until the final weeks of class. Certainly grades should remain completely open until after mid-semester. It was found--because of the newness of the investigatory techniques and the course's emphasis on problem-solving--that a significant number of excellent students initially did quite poorly. Because many of these same students, who received a grade of C or below on the mid-semester examination, were able to excel in linguistic analysis at the end of the semester, it was considered extremely poor pedagogy to penalize them too stringently for their early attempts at learning. Thus, the mid-term examination should be considered more a teaching rather than a grading device. It is, of course, imperative that it be closely evaluated and graded, but during the post-examination interview with those students who received C or below, it can be mentioned that their final grades have not been jeopardized. As a result of a similar postponement, grades in the experimental classes were predominantly determined by a student's performance on the papers, the problem sheets, the daily quizzes, and the final take-home examination. Such a postponement of evaluation is not as important in the second and third courses where students have already adjusted to the demands of the new discipline, but the very nature of the introductory course forces students to progress gradually. It is important that they reach a good level of competence by the end of the semester; unless they become discouraged too early, most students will do so.

The courses lend themselves to take-home examinations, and it is suggested that students be encouraged to work in small groups. The ability to do linguistic analysis is the important terminal goal and often group learning is the most effective way to accomplish it. Each student adds a few insights until they all know much more than they would had they worked separately. It is impossible to cheat, and it will become apparent in class discussion if there is a freeloader.

It is imperative that the size of the introductory course be restricted to less than twenty students. In practice, even this restricted number is excessive and it was necessary to divide once a week the experimental classes into two sections in order to adequately answer questions. It should be remembered that when students enter the course not only are they completely unaware of the nature of the discipline of linguistics, but also of its method of inquiry; therefore, they must learn its questions as well as its answers. It is possible to increase the size of the second course, "The English Language," to above twenty students; however, the third course, one in applied linguistics, should have a restricted enrollment. It is at that time that the individual interests and needs of students must be taken greatly into account. This is best accomplished in a seminar atmosphere.

Although there is an abundance of linguistic publication, there are no completely satisfactory texts for use in courses directed towards the linguistic preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher. It is necessary that several texts be purchased and that there be adequate linguistic holdings in the library. For the introductory course, "General Language and Linguistics" it is important that the student possess at least one text which enters into the specifics of linguistic analysis but does not restrict itself to English. It is for this reason that an introductory text in general linguistics--i.e., H. A. Gleason, Jr.'s An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics--was chosen. There are many linguistic readers, but H. B. Allen's Readings in Applied Linguistics was selected because its range of articles allowed it to be used as a text throughout the course sequence. N. Stageberg's An Introductory English Grammar was used because its self-corrective exercises were found to be a most effective pedagogical aid, even though they had to be closely watched for blurring the distinctions between structural and traditional grammar. The students were required to buy a traditional-functional grammar, Harrison's Practical English Grammar, because many students would not accept the limitation of traditional-functional grammar unless they could once more examine it. Often they had forgotten what it said and had substituted their own grammatical rules, based on their correct intuitions as a native speaker.

Because there is no adequate current text for the recommended course emphasizing the study of the English language, students must be prepared to buy several. For use in the experimental classes H. A. Gleason, Jr.'s Linguistics and English Grammar; Otto Jespersen's Philosophy of Grammar and Growth and Structure of the English Language; Andres Koutsoudas' Writing Transformational Grammar, An Introduction; and H. B. Allen's Readings in Applied Linguistics were required. In one course Owen Thomas' Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English, greatly supplemented by class lectures, discussion, and required reading, was used. However, because of the student's advanced status of preparation, in this second course it is possible to compensate for not having an adequate text through supplementary, non-text readings relating to transformational-generative linguistics, history of the English language, and non-grammatical areas of linguistics.

It is the third course, one in applied linguistics, for which it is most difficult to secure adequate texts. At present there are no classroom grammars written from a tagmemic perspective; therefore, it is necessary that the professor derive his lecture materials from a number of articles and books by Kenneth Pike, Robert Allen, Sidney M. Lamb, Henry Lee Smith, Jr., and others. After the introductory study of tagmemic grammar, the interests of the students might well determine the required texts. It is conceivable that there could be several separate lists of required texts and readings for the different interest groups within the class.

Training in traditional-functional grammar is evidently not conducive to teaching students how to ask investigatory questions. It was found that students who had excelled in such study had more difficulty in developing this ability than those who had done poorly in it. The former were generally the last to reject superficial rule-dominated linguistic analysis and had the most difficulty in penetrating a corpus whose components did not fit into preconceived categories. This was partially a result of their previous training which makes students distrustful of employing their intuitive knowledge of English as an aid in linguistic analysis. Such students must be taught to draw upon this knowledge as a means of testing the legitimacy of an analysis as well as a source of raw material for making comparisons. The ability to ask proper investigatory questions is closely related to the ability to utilize one's linguistic intuitions; therefore, the re-establishing of this skill is necessary.

Although it is often difficult to re-establish a student's confidence in the validity of his own intuitions concerning English structure, two techniques were found helpful. A professor can utilize the student's intuition in establishing grammatical rules before they are formally presented. For example, one can establish immediate constituent analysis through students' intuitive knowledge of English syntax. Structural linguistics is especially compatible with such an approach. A second such technique in re-establishing the student's confidence in the intuitive perceptions is the clarification of the distinctions between oral and written English. Often traditional-functional grammars, in their attempt to make grammar both functional and compact, combine linguistic areas in such a way as to grossly blur necessary distinctions: e.g., those differences between oral and written syntax, between usage and occurrence, between thought processes and sentences, between orthography and phonology, between etymology and morphology. It is the student's inability to distinguish these various elements which results in his belief that language is too chaotic to analyze. An early clarification of the meanings of the word grammar and its separation from the field of rhetoric, composition, and usage was found to be especially helpful in an attempt at clarifying linguistic relationships; W. Nelson Francis' article "Revolution in Grammar," was useful here.

A primary requirement of linguistic analysis is the separation of the spoken from written English. For this reason it is best to introduce phonemic study early in the first course. The ability to make conscious phonetic and phonemic distinctions is a skill, and as a result of their own lack of training, many students might well find it a difficult one to master. It is believed that with a little flexibility and several readings on the nature of phonology, and possibly a little help from the Speech Department whose teachers are generally better trained in this area, it is possible for English professors to adequately teach students how to prepare phonemic, if not phonetic, transcriptions. The use of self-corrective exercises such as those contained in N. Stageberg's An Introductory English Grammar is very helpful in reducing the number of class hours spent on phonology. With such a set of self-correcting exercises and the use of short daily quizzes to insure student preparation, in approximately three weeks it is possible to teach students how to distinguish and transcribe English phonemes, including suprasegmentals. The continuation of daily quizzes after the actual study of phonology has stopped makes it possible for the students to retain their knowledge and for the introduction of additional information--e.g., non-English phonemes, non-phonemic sounds, etc.--which gradually broadens the students' understandings of the nature of phonology.

Recommended Sequence of Courses

Three semesters must be allotted to English language and linguistic study if the prospective secondary school English teacher is to be prepared adequately in these areas. This is the minimal amount of time in which it is possible to train the future teacher so that he can effectively utilize current and soon-to-be-published materials and meet standards suggested by English department chairmen themselves or those set by recent guidelines. To some persons a three-semester preparation in language, in light of the fact that the time allotted to formal secondary school grammar instruction has decreased in recent years, might appear excessive. But it should be remembered that the decrease in secondary school language instruction has in all probability largely resulted from the poor preparation of teachers and the restricted validity of traditional-functional grammar. The fact that newer materials are emphasizing language study based on modern discoveries will undoubtedly result in a greater amount of time being allotted to its study.

An introductory course in linguistics for the English teacher-to-be should be one which increases his comprehension of the nature, complexity, and regularity of language in general and which introduces him to the numerous facets of the linguistic discipline. In addition to learning a system of grammatical analysis, the student should, as we have said, develop proper attitudes towards language and its study. One of the most damaging residues of the anachronistic teaching of traditional-functional grammar has been its narrowing and restricting of language study to the bits and pieces of grammatical analysis which are contained in handbooks. In spite of its tedious exercises in parsing sentences, traditional-functional grammar confounded a student's attempt to analyze adequately an individual language corpus. A student who has studied such a system believes that language, and the English language in particular, is too chaotic to lend itself to any systematic analysis and that one must be content with superficial explanations couched in inexact terms. Therefore, a major objective of the future English teacher's introduction to modern language study must be to separate, clarify, and often reject the various bits and pieces of this and that concerning the nature of language and grammar, basis for usage, written and oral English, logic and language, the relationship between composition and overt grammatical study, and the relationship between symbol and referent which he has gathered over the years. He must learn that language is extremely systematic and, therefore,--if one has but the proper tools and attitudes--analyzable. He must also realize that his intuitions as a native speaker are of the greatest assistance in analyzing a corpus.

The first course then must be one in general language and linguistics which is cyclic in nature, progressing from general lectures to specific investigation and thence to self-discovered linguistic generalizations. Through establishing a general attitudinal framework and by teaching analytic tools, the professor leads the students to discover specific qualities of language phenomena and utilizing these, professors and students together attempt to discover grammatical and linguistic generalizations. Through such a cyclic study the student reaches various learning stages--each one allowing him to interrogate discoveries and draw more accurate conclusions concerning the nature of language. After a plateau is reached, more complexities are discovered and a more sophisticated level of understanding results.

Ultimately both the organization and selection of linguistic material are dependent upon the abilities and interests of the instructor and students. Yet, given the goal of adequately preparing the prospective secondary school English teacher in the area of linguistic and English language study and the present state of the linguistic preparation of the entering freshmen, the following three courses may satisfactorily prepare the students to meet present and possibly future standards. It is realized that many non-linguistic professors--those who have received their training in literature rather than in linguistics--will not immediately see the need for three courses in this area of study, but, in truth, the future teacher cannot be well trained without at least three semesters of such study. To be adequately trained, the English teacher must have both an immediate basis for effective teaching and the background for absorbing new discoveries in the field. It is certainly the responsibility of the university departments training future English teachers to at least allow students the opportunity to become prepared in these areas, whether or not they feel justified in requiring the needed courses.

Course I: General Language and Linguistics

Students should realize early that language is a phenomenon which exists independently of man's analysis of it and that systems of analysis, as well as attitudes and beliefs concerning language, are dependent upon cultural and temporal variables. Thus, in a most basic sense, there can be no true analysis of language just as there is no true analysis of a biological culture. There is only the most accurate analysis at any given point in time. To understand this and the fact that there are several distinct theoretical and analytical approaches to language and its grammar, a week of the introductory course should be spent studying the history of linguistic investigation. As he studies this area, the student will understand that language study, like the study of other pure or social sciences before it, has slowly but finally broken away from Platonic, philosophical speculations and adopted a more scientific, objective method of investigation. Once given such a perspective, he finds it much easier to understand why traditional-functional grammar, consisting of bits and pieces of late eighteenth-century grammar, would be expected to be inaccurate--as inaccurate as eighteenth-century medicine. English majors should easily discern the eighteenth century's cultural stamp--marked by the middle class desire to rise in import, beliefs in universals, and the upper class prejudice against vulgate languages--placed on traditional-functional grammar.

There are several good introductions to the history of linguistics. Among the best is the first five chapters of H. A. Gleason's Linguistics and English Grammar which are both readable and comprehensive. Although there are several aspects of linguistic history--e.g., the juxtaposition of Panini with Plato and the latter's effect on eighteen centuries of linguistic investigation--which are not dealt with in the introductory chapters of Gleason's text, three class lectures are sufficient to call them to students' attention. Through such an introduction it is also possible to illustrate certain erroneous Greek conceptions concerning the nature of language, mind, and meaning which are often held by students trained in traditional-functional grammar. In short, one must supply a point in reference for the arduous task of weeding out erroneous conceptions.

There are various advantages to introducing the study of phonology (as related to structural linguistics) immediately following the lectures and readings on the history of linguistic investigation. The first advantage is that phonemic analysis--at least when approached from a structural point of view--is fairly exact and concrete. It can be entered into with a minimal amount of difficulties arising from conflicts with students' previous instruction in language and lends itself readily to a problem-solving method of teaching. The second advantage is that, because it is completely new to students, it can be used effectively to help wean students from their dependence on the written symbol.

Because the aim of the introductory course is language analysis in general and not the study of English in particular, one does not have to enter into such fringe controversies as what is the exact number of English allophones. However, it is possible, while utilizing whatever other languages the instructor knows, to use English as an illustrative example of a phonemic system as a means of broadening the students' comprehension of the systematic nature of language. Because most of the students in the class will have studied a foreign language, it is possible to make a cursory comparison of various phonemic systems. Such a comparison allows students to discover that there is a restricted number of phonemes employed in all phonemic systems--always less than the total number possible--and in order to make the hundreds of thousands of necessary distinctions, language systems must be extremely regular and therefore subject to an exacting analysis. Students begin to understand that individual sounds do not have meanings but serve only to unite and separate units to which meaning is attached. The system, not the individual sound, is important. The importance of a study of the suprasegmentals cannot be overemphasized. Not only is it basic to the first stage of grammatical analysis--if one remains within a structural framework--but it yields extremely versatile pedagogical aids. It is through the use of suprasegmentals that one can later reveal how very few phonemes and allophones can be utilized to create the myriad of morphemic and syntactic patterns which exists in a language.

Another advantage of early phonemic study is that it is very compatible with problem-solving and inductive methods of teaching. The student can be shown that he has to establish his generalization in much the same way that a scientist establishes his analysis. For example, when the student examines two sentences whose grammatical constructions differ as a result of differing suprasegmentals--e.g., Ice cream in the white house; I scream in the White House--and attempts to explain why these sentences are not ambiguous even though they have identical segmental phonemes, he must establish the exact nature of their difference--i.e., in the suprasegmentals of stress and juncture. With such an attempt at exactness, he has entered the world of modern linguistic analysis.

It is important that students eventually be able to make phonemic transcriptions from speech. Phonemic study rather than phonetic study is recommended because the latter requires that a great deal of class time be spent in making the students consciously aware of fine distinctions in sound. For many students it is very difficult to differentiate phonetic distinctions. The ability to transcribe accurately in phonemic symbols is a skill which takes time to develop and, therefore, should be introduced early in the semester. Short daily quizzes which regularly increase in complexity can be started at the end of the second week and continued less frequently throughout most of the semester. It is profitable to give students self-grading, written exercises similar to those contained in Norman Stageberg's An Introductory English Grammar. Such self-correcting exercises give the student practice in relating the symbol to the sound, and whenever his transcription differs from the one keyed--and it might well do so in certain instances--the difference can be explained by the instructor.

Although traditionally morphemic study follows instruction in phonemics, there is an advantage in inserting a brief examination of certain aspects of traditional-functional grammar before it is attempted. In the first experimental class it was noticed that much confusion resulted from the fact that students, especially those who had received high grades in traditional-functional grammar, allowed contradictory aspects of the new and the old to exist simultaneously in their minds. Not understanding the specific lacks of traditional-functional grammar, students attempted to twist new concepts into old molds. Of course, their resultant analyses of any corpus were inaccurate. This type of first-grammar interference is to be expected in the study of morphology, since at some time in his formal education the student has studied prefixes, suffixes, and roots. Struck by the surface similarity of such study to morphemic analysis, the student often believes the latter to be but an extension of the former. It is important, therefore, that he learn to question his previous formal training and to rely more upon himself as a native speaker for his data than upon the rules contained in his handbook.

Using the two elements now learned--phonemic analysis and historical perspective--the professor can lead the student into understanding specific limitations of traditional-functional grammar and the reasons for their development. There is usually ample evidence in the introduction and preface of a functional grammar to permit a student to recognize the erroneous eighteenth-century tenets upon which it is built. A close examination of several specific sections of a traditional-functional grammar can be a most effective method of introducing the student to the true nature of various syntactical and grammatical classes. By using examples from Old English, French, German, Spanish, or various non-Indo-European languages--examples are easily found in many introductory linguistic texts--the instructor can show how traditional-functional grammar fails to describe English nouns and verbs. Concomitantly he can illustrate the nature of categories such as tense, aspect, person, gender, agreement, plurality, and negation, and point out how various languages employ distinct ways of representing them. Through such an analysis, students begin to understand that grammatical categories are not universals and that even among Indo-European languages, which do possess similar categories, the ways of indicating categories are peculiar to each language. At least three weeks can be profitably spent in using such a base to illustrate the general nature of language as well as certain misconceptions concerning the nature of English.

After such a six-week introduction, students are ready for two to three weeks of morphemic investigation. Morphemic analysis is one of the weakest facets of structural linguistics, and it does not take students long to discover that it is too inexact and complex to meet the standards of a final analytic tool. Yet even with its limitations, it is a very valuable pedagogical tool and, like phonemic analysis, is very conducive to inductive teaching. In addition, when properly taught, it allows students to rely on their native intuitions, thus strengthening an all too frequently neglected pedagogical technique. It is also extremely useful in dispelling general misconceptions concerning the nature of meaning. Morphemic and suprasegmental analyses are most valuable tools for freeing the student from the vagueness which comes from relying on such traditional concepts as "context."

Using English as the illustrative language or target, immediate constituent analysis can be studied. It is extremely doubtful whether one should include in this study any mention of sentence patterns. As a pedagogical tool, the use of sentence patterns is very restricted and--as generally conceived--it is not analytically sound. There are many structural texts which treat immediate constituent analysis in detail. After adding three to four weeks of immediate constituent analysis to the other areas already investigated, the students are able to penetrate their language to a much greater depth. At this time it was found most useful to give them a take-home mid-term examination; such an examination forces the student to employ what he has learned. After the mid-term examination the professor will have a better conception of what he has accomplished. A few exercises based on H. A. Gleason's An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics might be attempted at this time.

At the end of this syntactic investigation approximately eleven weeks of a sixteen-week semester will have been spent and a basic decision must be made as to the emphasis of the next five weeks. By now the students should have broken away from their restrictive conception concerning the nature of language and they should possess an analytic tool--however limited--which allows them to be specific in their investigation of language. They should now have an objective attitude toward language analysis and should tend to look first for data upon which to build generalizations rather than for generalizations themselves. Before completing the introductory study of syntax, students are ready to begin work on their outside term-problem.

With the students bound to exacting and specific extra-class investigation, class lectures and assigned readings can shift to broader areas of study. Three weeks can be spent in a cursory examination of such areas as semantics, the history of writing, dialectology, lexicography, differences between the oral and written structural signals, and non-Indo-European languages. In short, the time may be spent in broadening the students' conceptions of the nature of language and in showing how an accurate grammatical analysis must be the foundation of any significant research in these areas.

The last two weeks of the semester should be spent in introducing the next level of linguistic analysis--transformational-generative grammar. One cannot even begin to study the subject in two weeks, but it is possible to lecture on its theoretical basis and to show certain advantages which it possesses over structural linguistics. The students must end the semester with a great amount of linguistic information, yet realizing that they have only begun to study the discipline.

The performance on a take-home final examination--usually given two weeks before the end of the semester--the term-problem, and the grades on the weekly problem sheets are an accurate gauge by which a student may be judged. It is important that the final examination and the term-problem be thought of more in terms of linguistic problems than as conventional English assignments. The student should be required to analyze a corpus, establish the correctness of his generalizations from the corpus itself, and be required to produce some original insights into the nature of the problem.

Course II: The English Language

The second course in the linguistic and English language preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher, which should have "General Language and Linguistics" as a prerequisite, should focus more directly on the nature of both historic and modern English. The student should be taught new and more sophisticated analytic tools and he should investigate directly several of the areas--e.g., modern American dialects, psycholinguistics, lexicography, semantics--which were only tangentially touched upon in the first course. Its material, like that of its predecessor, should be studied inductively with the students being guided to confront the particulars of a corpus and form accurate generalizations. It is in this second course that the formation of exact and valid generalizations concerning the nature of the English language is of equal import with the acquiring of a method of investigation.

By the end of the first semester, students will have discovered many of the limitations of structural analysis. Although structural linguistic analysis is extremely valuable as a pedagogical technique for introducing students to linguistic analysis, it is not a sufficiently exact or penetrating system to reach the primary nature of language phenomena. Although it may be more limited as pedagogical grammar, transformational-generative grammar is a much more powerful analytic tool. The student should begin the study of it at this time. Because transformational-generative grammar is a system of linguistic analysis which focuses very strongly on specifics--much more so than the less narrowly defined "structural linguistics"--it should be placed within the framework of a broader linguistic world. It is for this reason that its study is best delayed until the second semester. A too early, detailed study of transformational-generative grammar would free the student from one narrowly conceived language world only to accelerate him in another.

At the beginning of the second course, a few periods should be spent in familiarizing the student with the basic distinctions between structural and transformational-generative theory and the resultant analyses. Afterwards, at least eight weeks should be spent teaching the students a transformational-generative grammar and in giving them practice in its use. There are several texts devoted to developing analytic ability in transformational analysis, and it is not the purpose of this report to judge their individual merits. Of the ones most frequently used in English departments, Owen Thomas' *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English* and Paul Roberts' *English Syntax* are the most dated and therefore must be greatly supplemented by the teacher. However, even more recent texts such as Writing Transformational Grammar, An Introduction by Andres Koutsoudas (1966), are to a certain extent dated. The fact that the publication date of class texts is approximately four years behind linguistic research is an unpleasant but seemingly necessary fact of life. During the eight weeks of intensive study--which is probably the minimum amount that can be spent on this area and receive satisfactory results--secondary readings can be assigned on the nature of generative theory and its possible relationship to language acquisition, rhetoric, psycholinguistics, and developmental reading. Because the primary focus of this second course is on the English language, it is best to use it as the corpus upon which the transformational grammar is built. Again and again, the student should be brought into contact with the process of analyzing a corpus. The often-employed technique in learning transformational-generative grammar of progressing from a simple to more comprehensive grammar is a good pedagogical technique for eliminating the beginning student's tendency to believe in one correct analysis. Finally, towards the end of this eight-week period, some attention should be spent on generative phonology. In addition to its own merits, its study will remind the student that language is but phenomena and that he must never rely on the finality of any system of classification.

A student's ability to investigate historic English comes when he has mastered the analytic tools of structural and transformational grammar, possesses a fairly broad conception of the nature of language and the linguistic discipline, is free from prescriptive attitudes towards language study, has had considerable practice in the analysis of a corpus, and has reached a sufficient level of linguistic sophistication so that basic analytic questions are embedded in his nature. It is most effective and time saving to study old, middle, and modern English concurrently. Such a juxtapositional organization allows students to personally discover a myriad of developments, changes, and similarities between the various periods--discoveries which would take a full semester to present through any other method. In addition, this organization provides practice in doing what the student must eventually do as a teacher: solve linguistic problems. It is important that the student employ both structural and transformational techniques in his analysis. Not only does this often allow him to approach the phenomena from differing perspectives, but it provides practice in the use of his analytic tools and allows the teacher to further refine them. Thus he actually spends more time on structural and transformational grammar than it at first seems.

There are many ways to organize such a study. The first few class lectures might be spent discussing linguistic changes. Examples can be drawn from proto-Indo-European--T. Hudson-Williams' A Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar is an excellent little book which has samples of old English, middle English, early modern English, and modern English to illustrate what questions can be asked and specifically how analytic tools can be applied to discover aspects of the development of English. During this time the students can read one of the standard histories of the English language--e.g., Albert C. Baugh's History of the English Language, Margaret Bryant's Modern English and Its Heritage, Otto Jespersen's Growth and Structure of the English Language, Thomas Pyle's Origins and Development of the English Language, or the shorter Introduction to the English Language, by Albert Marckwardt. These books are for the most part self-explanatory and can be read rather rapidly. Afterwards, a two-page passage from an orthographically modernized version of Le Morte D'Arthur or a similar work can be given to students to analyze. For this first passage it is valuable to supply a list of suggested points to notice, such as the nature of semantic change in relation to individual prepositions or nominal and verbal affixes. The passage should be approached from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. Thus if students discover an adverbial syntactic structure which is not common in modern English, the syntactic position of adverbs (redefined according to transformational and structural classifications) needs to be investigated. Thus the student learns about modern and middle English simultaneously and can be led to draw valid generalizations concerning the development of English.

At this time students can be assigned reading in various traditional-scholarly texts such as Jespersen's A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles or Poutsma's A Grammar of Late Modern English or Curme's Parts of Speech and Accidence or Ralph Long's The Sentence and Its Parts. Such books contain a great wealth of specific information and are valuable in giving students needed raw data. By this time there is little danger of the student's uncritical acceptance of any material; however, a class lecture should be devoted to setting these works in their historical perspective.

The last two weeks of the course can be spent in extending the student's linguistic perspective by focusing his attention upon the effect that syntax has upon meaning and its role in determining intent. The study of distinctive feature analysis is most appropriate at this time, and a great deal can be accomplished by treating deep structures. The discovery that much of what they could previously explain only in terms of non-linguistic context can be accounted for by syntactic distinctions is a fascinating one for students. It would seem that a study of semantics must first be preceded by a more specific investigation into the nature of syntactic restrictions.

To many professors, six weeks spent in the study of both historic and modern English will appear--as indeed it is--much too restrictive; but it should be remembered that students have previously learned a great deal of specific grammatical knowledge through the use of English as a target language in the learning of analytic systems, and that old English is very amenable to illustrative use in the introductory course, "General Language and Linguistics." If one were to remove from a conventional course in the history of the English language the time which is necessarily spent on introducing the student to linguistic study, there would probably remain little more than five weeks actually devoted to historical study.

The above organizational framework lends itself quite well to the requiring of two papers--one problem-study and one research study. For the problem-study, the student might select a work or part of a work by Chaucer, Shakespeare, or some other non-modern writer and use it as a corpus and write a grammar (in the descriptive sense) of the author's language. Such a study allows the student to see distinctions between the author's language and modern English much more clearly than listening to several lectures. Often in these studies it is possible to discuss, although briefly, certain aspects of literary criticism. Other students might investigate the dialects of a work, or show how different authors represent the same dialect through different methods. Of course, an excellent study is to investigate the nature of a modern English dialect. A student should always be required to establish his conclusions or generalizations from his textual analysis. It is seldom that he cannot be more general. In using written texts the professor must be careful to point out the limitations of any specific text. If possible, some studies should be based on tape-recorded material.

The second paper might be the investigation of linguistic areas which have not been extensively discussed in class--e.g., dialectology, psycholinguistics, lexicography, semantics, possible relationships between linguistics and reading, composition, or literature. Such papers can treat the history of the area, its basic tenets, and--through a specific investigation--illustrate its resultant information. If these papers are reproduced for class distribution, they provide an effective means of broadening the scope of the second course.

Course III: Applied Linguistics

The third class in the three-course sequence designed for the linguistic preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher should not be considered a substitute for an English methods course, but rather as one in which final investigatory tools are learned, previously studied ones refined, and practice in relating linguistic theory and analysis to the broader fields of the discipline and to the teaching of English is given. It should be a course in purposeful and directed penetration into various language corpora and linguistic situations--situations which are often specifically similar to those that might appear in the classroom.

As stated earlier in this report, a distinction must be made between the needs and requirements of a linguist and those of a teacher of English. Although an English teacher needs to possess an analytic system which allows him to make accurate grammatical analysis, he also has need of a pedagogical grammar--one that allows him to focus quickly, specifically, and with various perspectives upon individual linguistic units which are often much smaller than a sentence. For their adaptability to these needs, tagmemically based grammars appear to offer tremendous possibilities as pedagogical aids. While retaining a high degree of penetrating power, they are able to focus simultaneously on various elements. The advantages are such that a future English teacher would have a knowledge of tagmemic theory and practice in the use of one tagmemically based grammar. Because such a grammar is partially built upon selected elements of both structural and transformational-generative grammars--although its theory is distinct from both--the study of it is much easier after students have worked with the other grammars. Thus, at the beginning of the third class at least six (perhaps even eight) weeks should be devoted to the study of the principles of a tagmemic grammar. Because of the unique nature of such a grammar, and its general adaptability to pedagogical situations, it is possible to relate its study to the teaching of composition, grammar, literary analysis, and stylistics at the very time that the grammar itself is being learned; and it is possible to relate it to pedagogical situations even in the initial stages of mastering it.

The second half of the third course should be spent in reading and solving problems in areas such as psycholinguistics; semantics; dialectology (especially modern American dialects); the relationships between linguistics and reading, composition, and second language or second dialect learning; various world dialects of English; current changes in English usage standards; lexicography; and various points of contact between language and culture. Because many of these areas will already have been studied by the students, in the third course the areas can be approached entirely from the point of view of problem-solving. Thus, theories on language learning might be related to specific oral and written corpora produced by a child who has difficulties with his speech and reading. Dialect interference might be investigated in relation to reading ability. Not only should linguistic analysis be used in the criticism of a poem, but the analysis should be related to a teaching situation.

It is profitable in this last course to require the students to write three papers of differing natures. One should be a purely theoretical investigation--

e.g., an attempt at establishing the syntactic differences between oral and written sentences or a comparison between two dialects. The second paper should be a research one. It should center on the student's particular area of interest, but it should also focus on a topic which will broaden his linguistic perspectives. It is possible for this paper to be written in three sections: the first giving the historical background and the general nature of the area under investigation, the second giving a summary of the research studies on the student's particular problem, and the third being an illustrative study typical of those accomplished in the area. The third paper should be a solution of an actual classroom problem which is related to the study of linguistics. If possible it is best to have the students relate all three papers to their principal areas of interest. Thus, a student whose first paper concerned itself with the nature of English sentences and whose second paper dealt with the relationship between linguistics and composition might be given a tape and written samples of a non-standard dialect speaker's performance as well as certain background information concerning his linguistic dialect, and then be asked to analyze the material and work out a specific plan for teaching. If such papers were duplicated and distributed to the class, they would be helpful as illustrations of teaching technique.

A Preliminary Experimental Course: English 101

The freshman English class, conducted during the first semester of the 1967-1968 academic year, unlike the other experimental courses, was only tangentially associated with Project Grammar's principal investigatory aims. More than any other aspect of the study, it was a wandering after questions as well as answers. Although it was adjuncted to the original research plan during the latter part of the first year, because of temporal and financial limitations it had very modest objectives. Certainly it was not designed to explore many of the possible relationships between linguistics and freshman composition. Its principal objectives were:

1. To investigate the feasibility of utilizing the existing freshman English curriculum to begin the linguistic preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher;

2. To decide if a linguistically prepared professor is able to utilize his training for the improvement of the composition skills of his students.

3. To explore the advantages or disadvantages of introducing freshman students to selective linguistic study.

As in the other experimental classes, the students of English 101 were selected entirely at random. The only common denominator for the class was the fact that no student had studied any but traditional-functional grammar nor had scored sufficiently high on the placement examination to merit admittance to English 103, "Advanced Freshman Composition." Of the twenty-three students enrolled in the course, there were three Negroes who had an individual but nevertheless observable non-standard dialect which was producing dialect interference in their writing. Two students were qualified for placement in remedial English--had such a course existed--and three students were extremely proficient in their use of written English. The remaining students could be placed somewhere in the broad category of average.

Classroom procedures and methods were slightly different for this course than for the other experimental ones. Although it was originally intended that the inductive method would be used to the same extent as in the other courses, the division of time and subject matter between composition and linguistics made it impossible to do so. Approximately one out of three class meetings was conducted by lecture, with time allotted for the answering of class questions. Prior to the mid-term examination, language study was dominant; after that, the amount of class time spent in discussing student writing and in utilizing their own papers as the corpora for linguistic analysis was increased until it was felt that linguistics and composition had merged effectively. At no time was there an absolute separation of the two elements. Literature was not discussed until the last two weeks of class.

Reading assignments were made from all four required texts: Nelson Francis' The English Language, An Introduction; A. Marckwardt and F. Cassidy's Scribner Handbook of English; Anderson and Stageberg's Introductory Readings on Language (rev. ed.); and William Carlos Williams' White Mule. Weekly non-reading assignments alternated between a three- to five-page theme and a series of linguistic problems similar to those used in the upper division courses. The students were also required to prepare selected exercises from the texts. A mid-term and a final examination, consisting of questions and problems on linguistic analysis as well as the rewriting of a poorly constructed passage, were given. A final paper of seven to ten typed pages on some stylistic aspect of White Mule was also required. Themes, problems, and exercises were returned to students with appropriate comments within three days. After the mid-term examination, conferences were set up with all students to discuss individual problems.

Class lectures and discussions were not always restricted to the assigned readings. Generally the weekly lecture was on a topic not included in the texts, and the class discussions would often center on some aspect of a student's writing. In the latter instances an attempt was made to relate the problem under discussion to recent linguistic readings. All told, there were fourteen class periods devoted to lecture. Most were language centered, a few were composition centered, and a few were literature centered. The general topics were as follows:

1. Language, Linguistics, and Traditional-functional Grammar:
   This lecture attempted to separate the three areas of language into phenomena, discipline, and specific investigatory approach. Traditional-functional grammar was set in historical perspective and compared to pre-nineteenth century science and medicine.

2. Grammar, Usage, Composition, and Rhetoric:
   Using the elements of the Scribner Handbook of English as examples, this lecture attempted to separate these basic elements and clarify their relationships to one another. Prose examples distinguishing grammaticality from ungrammaticality, standard from non-standard usage, and composition from rhetoric were employed.

3. The Nature of Language, Written versus Oral English:
   This lecture attempted to illustrate the primacy of the oral language and give reasons why an accurate analysis of English must be built upon an oral corpus. It illustrated some of the errors of traditional-functional grammar which resulted from its ignoring spoken English.

4. Language as System, Introduction to Phonology I:
This lecture presented the English phonemic system.

5. Language as System, Introduction to Phonology II:
This lecture presented the suprasegmentals of English.

6. Dialects:
Using selected phonemic, syntactic, and morphemic contrasts among non-standard and standard dialects, this lecture attempted to show that all speech is dialect speech and that only the prestige of its speakers establishes one dialect as superior to another. It was shown that all dialects were equal in communicative ability and regularity of system. Tape recordings of a Negro, a Hawaiian pidgin, and a Southern speaker were used.

7. Language Change:
Using English as an example, this lecture attempted to give the class some awareness of the process of language change.

8. Written versus Spoken English I:
This lecture attempted to make the students aware of the history of writing, the contrasts between written and spoken English conventions, differences in written and spoken syntax, and syntactic and morphemic distinctions between acceptable high school and college prose.

9. Written versus Spoken English II:
This lecture was a continuation of the material of lecture eight.

10. Meaning, Ambiguity, and Sentences:
This lecture attempted to utilize various tenets of structural analysis--e.g., form and function words, immediate constituent analysis, suprasegmentals--in order to increase the student's awareness and control of morphemic selection, structural ambiguity, and written sentences. Class discussion focused on the difference between the sentence as a rhetorical and as a linguistic unit.

11. Investigation and Delineation of a Topic, Details and Generalization:
This was a conventional lecture attempting to aid students in the delineation of their subjects and the use of supportive or illustrative examples.

12. Point of View, A Technique of Composition:
This lecture attempted to explain various points of view and to illustrate how they could be utilized in exposition.

13. Style and Tone:
This lecture, using passages from White Mule as illustrations, attempted to show how omission, understatement, and simplicity of structure could be effectively used to create various tones.

14. White Mule, Levels of Meaning:
This lecture treated the four interpretative levels of the novel White Mule--the prose account of an individual's struggle to retain

his values in a hostile environment, the story of the assimilation of two immigrant cultures into American life, the problems and struggles of the immigrant in America, and the myth of the birth, growth, and future of the American culture--and focused on the use of grammatical ambiguity as an artistic technique.

Reading assignments paralleled the weekly lectures. All of Francis' The English Language, An Introduction was assigned; chapters three ("The Sentence"), four ("The Word"), six ("Grammar"), and nine ("Usage") in the Scribner Handbook of English were assigned for class discussion, and other chapters were individually assigned as needed; most of the contents of Introductory Readings on Language was assigned; and White Mule was read in its entirety. However, the more specialized articles in the language reader--e.g., Eugene Nida's "Analogical Change," Norman C. Stageberg's "The Sound System of English," Harold B. Allen's "On Accepting Participial Drank," as well as the chapter entitled "Language and Literature" in the language reader were omitted.

As can be seen from examining the assignments, students were not required to do extensive grammatical analysis. In fact, only a minimal amount--that which was necessary for students to realize that grammatical generalizations must be based on observable specifics and that surface syntactic similarities are often misleading--was required. The objective was not to teach a linguistics course for freshmen, but to free them from the vagueness and inexactness of their previous training and to bring them into direct contact with the structural specifics of their language. Because it lends itself to selection and partial study, structural linguistics was studied. A student can learn to manipulate immediate constituent analysis, suprasegmentals, and the five basic structures quite rapidly; with these tools he can do, however tentatively, more accurate and regular linguistic analyses than he has previously been able to do.

Although a second semester course was not conducted, it is conceivable that its organization would be similar to that of the first semester course. In all probability, composition assignments would need to focus more on the writing of research papers and critical interpretations of literary selections. Linguistic analysis would increase in depth and students would learn to analyze complicated structures and the specific ways in which structures can be transformed to produce various artistic effects. In all probability, more literature could be introduced and it could serve both as a linguistic corpus and as a subject source for themes. To many instructors the technique outlined above will not appear to differ significantly from the method of instruction that they already employ. In truth, the difference might lie in the fact that the above would provide the student with specific tools and attitudes by which he could confront his own writing directly rather than relying on his unconscious absorption of linguistic principles.

One class of twenty-three students is not a representative sample and therefore only the most tentative conclusions can be drawn. An examination of all papers written during the first and last weeks of class did reveal that the level of writing of all students had greatly improved. When one considers the varied nature of the incoming students, two questions must be asked:

1. At what price to the instructor's time was such an improvement gained?

2. In what way did a linguistically centered course seem to aid in this general improvement?

The instructor felt that the use of linguistic material significantly contributed to the ease with which he was able to work with such a varied group. The general high interest of the students in the study of language produced a common denominator which focused the students' attention on linguistic specifics and, therefore, stylistics. Had the class been literature centered, it is certain that the speakers of distinctly nonstandard dialects, the two remedial students, and those who were already proficient in English prose would have received minimal aid. The variety of the students' needs and abilities made it necessary to find a common denominator, for, as any freshman composition teacher knows, it is almost impossible to separate students within a class into two sections. However, because it was possible to select the linguistic principles and materials which could be applied to a specific student's needs, a great many direct applications of linguistics to composition could be made. Professor Andrew MacLeish, University of Minnesota, was asked at a recent NCTE meeting what he saw as the value of teaching grammatical knowledge; he answered that it made language study specific and exact. This is perhaps the greatest justification for including not only modern grammatical analysis but some general linguistic study as well in freshman composition courses. In no other field is the student required to produce such an exact and specific product with such an inexact and nebulous knowledge of his artistic material.

The advantages to the prospective secondary school English teacher of an early introduction to a linguistic method of inquiry are numerous. Such an introduction would allow the advanced language courses to begin on a more sophisticated level and remove many of the causes of the initial difficulties which confront a junior or senior student in his attempt to readjust his attitudes towards language. With such an introduction in the freshman year, it might be possible--given a sufficient amount of co-operative planning--to alter the recommended three-course series to a freshman English course, two full semester courses in English language study and linguistics, and part of an English methods or advanced composition class. But in addition to the obvious advantages to the future English teacher, there are at least two other justifications for including some systematic language study in freshman English courses. Language study has both the practical value of aiding in the teaching of composition and the humanistic value of introducing students to an area--language--which has been sadly neglected in their education. For liberal art colleges, this latter justification is especially significant. It is difficult to imagine a liberally educated student who is completely ignorant of this discipline.

The answer to the question as to whether or not such a linguistically based freshman English course is a more effective method of producing good writers was beyond the scope of Project Grammar's sortie into linguistics and composition; but certainly it was found to be at least as effective as any other method. Because of its novelty and its more direct relationship to composition, systematic language study is probably a more effective base than literature for aiding remedial students.

Only those students who were most proficient in traditional-functional grammar were initially resistive to the extension of the boundaries of the linguistic world. However, in English 101 as in the upper division courses, these students usually experienced a reversal of their opinions around the middle of the semester. For the other students, prospective liberal arts majors or not, the interest level remained quite high throughout the entire course. A questionnaire, which permitted anonymity, was completed by the students the last day of class. It revealed that ninety percent of the students considered such a language-centered course both valuable and interesting. But what was most noticeable was something which was also noted in other experimental classes such as those conducted by the University of Oregon English Curriculum Study Center which used a transformational-generative basis--some of the poorer writers, poorer students in general, were among the most highly interested and motivated participants. This is due partially to the fact that because modern grammatical systems reflect the native speaker's intuitive knowledge of his language, for the first time these students--who found it impossible to memorize the many sterile rules of traditional-functional grammar--are no longer disfranchised members of the linguistic community. Undoubtedly another reason for their great interest is that language--which was once but a chaotic set of exceptions to rules--is shown to consist of a regularity which they can grasp.

A language-centered, rather than a literature-centered course, was found especially valuable in dealing with the problems of non-standard dialect speakers of English. Because of the current social revolution, a certain atmosphere of objectivity must be established before dialect interference can be discussed. Through broadening the linguistic world of all students and removing their conscious prejudices--e.g., the belief that one dialect is communicatively superior to another--the task of making a student aware of the distinctions between his dialect and the standard one is much easier. In their pure state, dialect distinctions are extremely regular, but because the non-standard college dialect speaker has often been attempting to adopt standard writing and speech for a good many years, dialect interference might appear in one paper and not in another. As a result it is often difficult to establish general grammatical distinctions for an individual speaker. Such irregularity is partially dependent on the constructions used but also upon other variables such as the emotional state of the writer. It was found that when these students wrote on a topic which was highly emotionally charged, dialect interference was much more noticeable. It was also noted that the student was unaware of any alteration from one dialect to another and that he could not recognize the non-standard constructions as belonging to his home dialect. Two dialects had simply been welded together into his own personal idiolect, which was somewhere between standard and non-standard speech. To aid such a student, both the teacher and the student need a certain amount of linguistic sophistication.

Because of the now greater educational opportunities for the poor, more Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Appalachians will seek advanced education, and colleges will increasingly be faced with the problem of non-standard dialect speakers. Even now it is a rare freshman composition class that does not contain a few such students. These students differ linguistically in two ways from the non-standard dialect speakers who entered college in large numbers after World War II and the Korean Conflict. Not only is the gap between their dialect and so-called standard English greater, but, unlike their middle class predecessors, their numbers are insufficient to effect a change in standard English. In the ghetto or hill school from which they come, often there are more pressing problems to be solved than those created by linguistic prejudices. Thus, having had neither a realistic opportunity nor a valid cultural reason to alter their dialect, these students enter college with only a minimal knowledge of standard English.

Teaching composition to students such as these presents an instructor with unusual and complex problems. The instructor must be able to distinguish these dialect students from students of low intelligence who somehow slipped by the entrance committee and he must understand the dual nature of their problem--that of the difficulties caused by the transition from high school to college prose and that caused by first dialect interference. Much of a dialect speaker's difficulty in written composition is due to his having to express his thoughts in a dialect whose grammatical rules conflict with his own. The expressional difficulties resulting from such a conflict are much more complex than ones of mere vocabulary. They arise from conflicting phonological, morphological, syntactical, and semological systems. Because of the complexity of these differences, common theme corrections are often meaningless. To tell such a student to make his subjects and verbs agree is ridiculous. His subjects and his verbs do agree.

It will do minimal good to simply correct individual errors which appear on isolated themes. Yet if the instructor were to use these themes as a corpus from which to deduce the deep conflicting grammatical patterns, he could reach specific linguistic generalizations. Once these generalizations are explained to the student, many errors produced by conflicting patterns can be eliminated. Thus, if the instructor understands the nature of a Negro's verb system, he can explain to the student the specific areas of conflict and make him aware of the regularity of his errors. The student will then be consciously aware of specific areas of possible difficulties.

Dialect interference is but an extension of a similar phenomenon affecting almost all college freshmen; i.e., the large rift between the acceptable syntactic patterns of high school and college prose. As prose becomes more rhetorical, not only do some of its syntactic structures infrequently appear in normal speech, but many combinations of them probably never occur. This distinction is complicated by written conventions and how they relate, or do not relate, to the oral language. But if the writer is aware of his oral dependence on suprasegmentals, repetition, and paralinguistic phenomena such as gesture and eye-contact, he will be more likely to compensate for their loss in written English. Some people continue to generalize unconsciously in order to form the rules of written English just as they earlier had generalized to form those of oral English, but such persons are rare. At an early age most of us lose our unconscious ability to deduce general laws from language phenomena and, as a result, we must be taught the distinctions between oral and written English. If this is not done, the one will constantly interfere with the other. Thus at the very time when he most needs help, the college freshman has largely outgrown the criteria by which he has previously tested his structures--his intuitive grammar.

In the experimental freshman course it was found that students readily understood and utilized the distinctions between oral and written conventions, structural signals, and morphemes once they were clear as to the exact relationship between oral and written English. It was their unawareness of the basic distinctions between grammar, rhetoric, usage, and oral and written English which made many of them insecure in their writing. Because they were not certain why some structures and morphemes which they had always used were being rejected, they had no way to pre-test a sentence for its acceptability. In general, it was felt that by using language as an informational base and by attempting to relate indirectly language problems to individual composition problems, the instructor possessed the broadest possible tool for solving them. Of course, there are many rhetorical problems in which a knowledge of linguistics is of no value, but there are many in which it is.

Certainly few persons would object to the statement that a liberally educated student should know something besides old wives' tales about the nature of his language; yet the state of linguistic ignorance of entering freshmen is incredible.

When one considers the vague and nebulous conception of language that most entering freshmen possess, it is no wonder that he often finds it impossible to pay close attention to his writing. The wonder is not that he writes poorly, but that he writes at all. Not only does he not have a rudimentary understanding of the nature of language, but his attitudes towards language and its study are very negative. He is quite convinced that language is too chaotic to have any general laws; therefore, any attempt to find them is but a waste of time. The total realm of the known linguistic world is thought to be contained in his handbook and desk dictionary--of which he has never considered the origin. To him the grammar of a language is quite apart from what one speaks; not only does he believe that written English is primary, but that, ideally, oral English should be modeled after it. He is unable to make any significant penetration into a given corpus and, in truth, does not have the vaguest notion as to what questions could and should be asked. He has been nourished on a Lowthian stew of Latin and English grammar, seasoned liberally with incorrect thoughts on the nature of usage, spelling, dialects, meaning, oral and written English. Such a regrettable state will change as the impact of the English curriculum study centers increases, but for the next few years the general state of freshman language ignorance will remain. While it is regrettable that the entering freshman has such gross misconceptions concerning language in general and his own language in particular, it would be deplorable were he allowed to graduate from college with the same unaltered ignorance. For many, "Freshman Composition" is the most logical course in which to receive a certain basic introduction to language.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the length of the study and the complexity of the problem, an attempt has been made to draw conclusions and to make recommendations throughout the body of this report. However, certain ones may be repeated here.

The questionnaires and interviews conducted by Project Grammar reveal near unanimity on one major point: the present preparation of most secondary English teachers in the area of language is grossly inadequate. Chairmen of English departments, chairmen of departments of education, college teachers of English language courses, and a number of eminent linguistic scholars are in general agreement on this point.

Granted the need, however, respondents are by no means in agreement concerning the best way to provide adequate preparation. Some respondents apparently believe that a single two-hour course can do the job; at the other extreme, some believe that room must be found somehow for forty-five semester hours of work in language. The majority believe that approximately ten hours of course work--say three courses--is the best or at any rate the only practicable solution.

What the content of these courses should be is still matter for hot debates, with some respondents favoring continued emphasis on traditional-school grammar, some favoring structural or transformational-generative or tagmemic or something else, and with some voting for broadly conceived preparation in all phases of language and others for narrow but intensive grammatical analysis. English department chairmen, most of whom are well prepared in literature and not well prepared in language, almost uniformly believe that their departments should increase English language offerings and requirements but are extremely uncertain about what the changes should consist of.

The number, type, and standards of the linguistic and English language courses presently required of the prospective secondary school teacher of English are overwhelmingly controlled by English departments. Because a very limited number of institutions have separate linguistics departments, if the prospective teacher does not receive adequate preparation in this area in his major department, it is impossible for him to do so at all. Clearly the responsibility for the linguistic and English language preparation of the prospective secondary school English teacher lies with the English departments. It was noticeable that although there was general agreement on the part of the respondents that the prospective secondary school English teacher's training in this vital area is grossly inadequate, a serious attempt is not being made to rectify this situation. Regrettably, we are presently graduating teachers who we know are deficient in an extremely important aspect of their discipline. We are, in a sense, producing already obsolete teachers.

The discrepancy between the linguistic and English language training recommended by the respondents and what is actually being offered in colleges and universities across the country is so great that some attempt must be made to supply a plausible explanation. The questionnaire responses suggest that although many members of English departments are convinced that more language study is needed, they are not sufficiently familiar with the specifics of modern linguistic research to decide what to add or change. It can be said that, for the most part, members of English departments generally underestimate the amount of time required to master the rudiments of modern language analysis. Their minds and attitudes are still greatly restricted by their own training in traditional-functional grammar and, as a result, they do not fully understand the complexities--or the advantages--of modern linguistics. As one such professor expressed it, "After all, haven't we known everything there is to know about language for hundreds of years?"

Perhaps as a result of this involuntary narrowness English departments tend to think in terms of linguistic facts and rules to be memorized rather than of analytic processes to be learned or mastered. Because they do not conceive of an analytic system separate from the discovered facts of a language, they tend to emphasize the mastering of all known material. It is this which explains why they consistently think in terms of courses rather than interrelated linguistic fields. The English department chairman, if he is one who believes that prospective secondary school English teachers need to know a significant amount of linguistic knowledge, wants to require a course in almost everything--semantics, structural grammar, traditional grammar, transformational-generative grammar, tagmemics, history of the English language, psycholinguistics, dialectology, etc. He realizes the impossibility of having so many hours devoted to language and linguistic study, but he sees no other way to approach the problem.

There is, of course, a way by which the future English teacher can be adequately prepared in linguistics and English language study without turning him into a linguistic major, but to do so a basic distinction must be made between analytic theories, investigatory tools, subject matter to be investigated, and linguistic attitudes.

Grammatical systems of analysis--such as structural, transformational-generative, and tagmemic grammars--are not information blocks to be memorized but investigatory tools based on theoretical assumptions and hypotheses concerning the nature of language. Thus when one learns transformational-generative grammar, he does not learn English grammar; rather, he learns a method of inquiry which can then be applied to English or Hindi in order to discover English or Hindi grammar. He does not learn the result, but the process. It must be realized that the learning of a process is, in actuality, the learning of a skill and, therefore, there is a temporal element involved. Not only does it take time to learn how to analyze language using a modern system of analysis, but it takes time and practice to develop competency in manipulating the tool. In addition, because linguists from time to time refine and alter the investigatory tool, the future teacher must have some knowledge of the theory basic to the tool--e.g., transformational-generative theory or tagmemic theory. In the final analysis, the future teacher must learn the process so that he can do his own analysis, for no one is likely to write the grammar of English for a good many years. Language is the subject matter to which one applies the analytic system derived from the linguistic theory. Thus historic or modern English, rather than being a field of study, is in reality a large corpus which one may analyze many different ways depending on the systems of analysis employed. If one attempts to learn the history of the English language before one masters a system of analysis, a barrier is automatically created and only fruitless memorization will result.

The experimental courses conducted at Illinois Wesleyan, including an introductory linguistics course, a course specifically devoted to the English language, and a third course concerned with direct application of linguistic theory, offered one way to incorporate what teachers of college English language courses, abetted by eminent linguists, believe should be included. There may be better arrangements; and the content and emphasis of these courses are certainly subject to critical scrutiny, but the results of the Wesleyan experiment, measured subjectively, suggest that in three courses it is possible to develop in prospective English teachers fairly broad and relatively deep understanding of the English language and the ways that it works.

In light of the tremendous array of disagreements in this field, recommendations can be made only in terms less specific than the investigators hoped would be the case when they began:

1. Each college and university should scrutinize its English language offerings and requirements for prospective teachers, in an attempt to discover whether they are really adequate for the job that secondary English teachers are expected to do in their classrooms.

2. College courses in English grammar should make students aware of varied methods of linguistic analysis and of the strengths and limitations of each method.

3. Within the total package of required courses there should be a place for considerable emphasis upon practical application of linguistic principles in the classroom. Although solid theoretical underpinnings are essential, applications cannot be left entirely up to the neophyte teacher.

4. Linguistic analysis is a practical tool to the secondary school teacher of English, a skill he must master if he is to be able to meet successfully the myriad language situations he will encounter during his professional career. It must be taught to him in such a way as to allow him to fully understand how to apply it. However, before he can penetrate and understand his language, a student must possess scientific and objective attitudes towards it. Both proper linguistic attitudes and skills are best taught inductively. Previous narrow and chaotic concepts on the nature and range of language were most successfully altered through the student's

working out linguistic problems which disproved his previously cherished misconceptions. To work out linguistic problems, he must have practice in the use of analytic tools.

5. The study of the English language must not be narrowly conceived. Systems of linguistic analysis, though important elements, are only one ingredient of language. If secondary school teaching of the language is to be as fascinatingly informative and helpful as it can be, it must go beyond systems of analysis into such areas as dialectology, history of the language, lexicology, and semantics. But such a change will not occur unless colleges prepare teachers well enough that they are familiar with these areas.